DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 086 679 SP 007 619

AUTHOR	Maddox, Kathryn, Ed.
TITLE	In West Virginia, It Is Working. One Teacher Education Center in Action.
INSTITUTION	American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	64p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publication Dept., American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Suite 610, One Dupont Circle, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 ($2.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Inservice Teacher Education; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; *Preservice Education; *Professional Continuing Education; *Teacher Centers; Teacher Educator Education; Teaching Experience

ABSTRACT

This publication explains the concept of the Multi-Institutional Teacher Education Center (MITEC) in Kanawha County, West Virginia. The center emphasizes the shared responsibility of public schools, communities, students, the state department of education, and colleges in providing continuous professional development of pre- and in-service teachers. Some of the basic tenets found in the MITEC program are: a) each participating college and university agrees to orient students to the school district, the Learning Laboratory Centers, and MITEC; b) the Advisory Committee works cooperatively to develop objective, performance-based evaluation forms for students; c) continuous evaluation is provided to give new dimensions to the center's structure; d) the Advisory Committee agrees on recognition and honoraria for clinical supervising teachers to eliminate competition and discord; and e) the role of the colleges in the center shifts from supervising students to consulting, counseling, and providing in-service programs to MITEC participants. Another facet which is now being implemented at the center is the sequencing of pre- and in-service teacher education to provide continuous teacher education. (BRB)

ED 086679

IN WEST VIRGINIA, IT IS WORKING

One Teacher Education Center in Action

Edited by
KATHRYN MADDOX, Coordinator
Kanawha County Multi-Institutional Teacher
Education Center (MITEC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
AACTE
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

A Service Publication for Teacher Educators by
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES
FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
One Dupont Circle, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

SP 007 619

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Copyright © 1972 by

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES
FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
One Dupont Circle, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036

Standard Book Number: 910052-58-1
Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 72-075367

FOREWORD

The need for cooperation has never been greater. Today's public demands better teachers. Students and teacher educators are concerned about relevant courses and providing earlier laboratory experiences for students preparing to teach. Public school teachers and college professors are wondering when their next promotion might be based on demonstrated teaching competencies and students' achievement rather than on tenure or seniority. State departments of education are being looked to for leadership in this era which calls for partnership alignments of school systems with colleges and universities. Cooperation for improving continuous teacher education is the goal.

New collaborative arrangements where multi-institutions and multi-agencies work together to bring about change in teacher training bring, as well, many unanswered questions. How can a cooperative teacher education center be organized without federal funds? How can colleges and universities retain autonomy in such a consortium? What are the commitments and responsibilities of each of the agencies in the cooperative center? How do we get started? Are there any models in operation where cooperation and commitment of school systems, colleges, state departments of education, professional organizations, and community agencies are evidenced? What are the problems of such a consortium? This publication attempts to provide answers and insights to these questions.

Kanawha County Multi-Institutional Teacher Education Center (MITEC), emerging as a result of the Multi-State Teacher Education Project (M-STEP) in West Virginia, serves as the focal model of this publication. Since the origin of MITEC in 1968, West Virginia has responded to the call for cooperation by an all-out effort to establish state-wide Teacher Education Centers. At the time of this publication, the State Department of Education has assumed a leadership role in establishing six centers throughout West Virginia. This has been made possible by financial commitment of the 1971 legislature. Each of the seventeen teacher preparation institutions in the state is a member of at least one of the six centers.

The commitment of the Kanawha County School system in providing staff and financial assistance has been a major factor in implementing the MITEC program. Special recognition and appreciation are

expressed to all those who have been instrumental in establishing Teacher Education Centers and who have paved the way for this new era through service and writings.

Special thanks is extended to the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) for encouragement and support for innovation and cooperation of the Teacher Education Center concept. The staff has provided the impetus for expanding the operational base of teacher education from a single institution to that of multi-institutional, multi-cultural, multi-state, to multi-nation consortiums. Alternate experiences designed to broaden a student's background for teaching in today's world are presented at length in this publication.

Just as the Center could not operate successfully without the teamwork and commitment of many people and many agencies, this publication would not have been possible without contributions and cooperation of all MITEC participants. Special recognition is given to:

Sharon Burton – *Teacher*, Job Corps Center
Corinne Davis – *Director of Student Teaching*, West Virginia State College
Joseph Flaherty – *Director of Preservice and Continuing Education*, West Virginia State Department of Education
James Gladwell – *Deputy Superintendent*, West Virginia State Department of Education
JoAnn Hall – *Clinical Professor*, Andrew Jackson Junior High
Mildred Holt – *MITEC Special Projects Coordinator*
Richard Hunt – *Principal*, Andrew Jackson Junior High
David Koontz – *Director of Inservice*, Marshall University
Kathryn Maddox – *MITEC Coordinator*
Anne Rada – *Clinical Professor*, Piedmont Elementary
Juanita Reed – *Classroom Teacher*, John Adams Junior High
John Santrock – *Associate Superintendent*, Kanawha County Schools
Harry Scott – *Chairman*, Division of Teacher Education, West Virginia State College
Ruth Smith – *Supervisor*, Kanawha County Schools
Marilyn Stone – *Classroom Teacher*, Andrew Jackson Junior High
Tom Stone – *Classroom Teacher*, Andrew Jackson Junior High
Phil Suiter – *Director of Teacher Preparation*, West Virginia State Department of Education
Virginia Wylie – *Principal*, Piedmont Elementary

Kathryn Maddox – *Coordinator for MITEC*
Edward Pomeroy – *Executive Director of AACTE*
March 1972

CONTENTS

FOREWORD iii

INTRODUCTION 1

MITEC: ONE APPROACH TO COOPERATIVE TEACHER EDUCATION 3
- Organization 3
- Problems and Pitfalls 4
- Implications and Projections 6

LEARNING LABORATORY CENTERS 9

INSTITUTIONAL LINKAGES IN COOPERATIVE CENTERS 13
- Colleges and Universities 13
- School Systems 18
- Professional Link 21
- Community Link 23
- State Department of Education 25

INDIVIDUAL LINKAGES: A DIFFERENTIATED CONSORTIUM 29
- Public School Types 29
  - Aides 29
  - School-Based Teacher Educator 32
  - Principal: Curriculum Leader of the School 34
  - County/School District Supervisor 36
- College Type Roles 36
- Cooperative Type Roles 38
  - Students of Teaching 38
  - Clinical Professor 40
  - Center Coordinator 41
  - Special Projects Coordinator 44
  - Inservice Coordinator 45
  - Research and Development Coordinator 45

MITEC OPTIONAL ENRICHMENT MODULES 47
- Job Corps Center Module 49
- Remedial Reading Center Module 51
- Inner-City, Interstate, Intrastate, International Modules 52

EMERGING DIMENSIONS IN CONTINUOUS EDUCATION 55
- Inservice for Clinical Supervising Teachers 56
- Inservice for Students of Teaching 58

SUMMING IT UP 61

INTRODUCTION

Both schools of education and school systems have erred in believing the myth that teacher education was the sole responsibility of the teachers colleges. In actuality, over a period of time, the university has broadened its services to meet the demands of more public agencies. Some members of the university have resisted these demands, especially in the education of teachers, perceiving in them a threat to the university as a center of research, educational excellence, and contemplation. They have voiced dire warnings of ultimate educational mediocrity. All too often the university becomes an instrument for maintaining the *status quo*, and sometimes is rather conservative, in comparison to others involved in teacher education. In matters of teacher education, the university must learn to utilize, in positive and productive ways, the public school system and the larger community of which it is a part.

By the same token, public schools have historically been unwilling to assume real responsibility for preservice education of teachers, except for providing classrooms and teachers to supervise student teaching experiences. They have made no really serious intellectual or financial commitment to staff development through inservice training. The idea that the university prepares or produces the teachers and the public schools consume them must be abandoned. Both must view themselves as preparers of teachers and assume joint responsibility for continuous teacher education.

A Teacher Education Center as defined in this model is a *concept* rather than a physical place. It recognizes the principle of *shared sovereignty*. Thus, it involves public schools, communities, students, the state department of education, and colleges in matters of teacher education. It is an acceptance of the principle of parity in the allocation of responsibility for educating teachers. It implies new administrative and financial relationships which involve joint appointments and shared budgets. Individuals who are involved in these new relationships accept the intrinsic worth of exchange programs for public school and college personnel. Individual, group, and institutional experiences at all levels of the education spectrum are viewed as avenues of expression and understanding, through which the student of teaching may build a positive self-image and begin to relate to others in nondefensive ways.

Chapter I

MITEC: ONE APPROACH TO COOPERATIVE TEACHER EDUCATION

Organization

Kanawha County Multi-Institutional Teacher Education Center (MITEC) is an outgrowth of a seven-state project known as the Multi-State Teacher Education Project (M-STEP). As a result of concern expressed by people responsible for teacher education in several states, a program was launched to seek ways to improve teacher education, particularly in the area of laboratory experiences.

M-STEP in West Virginia was directed specifically toward this goal by the development of a Pilot Center for Student Teaching. In the initial phase of the project, this Pilot Center was established in cooperation with the Kanawha County school system. Approximately thirty students from the five institutions of higher learning comprising MITEC were assigned to the Pilot Center for their student teaching experience.

The institutions, representing a variety of educational types, included the following: Concord College, a multi-purpose, state-supported institution at Athens; Marshall University, a state university at Huntington; Morris Harvey College, an independent institution located at Charleston; West Virginia State College, a former black college, located at Institute, and West Virginia Institute of Technology, an engineering college with a secondary teacher education program, at Montgomery.

An Advisory Committee composed of the Center coordinator, one representative from each of the participating higher education institutions, three representatives from the Kanawha County public schools, and one representative from the State Department of Education was appointed to act as a policy-making group for the Pilot Center. Through a series of meetings, this Advisory Committee and subcommittees directed the development of objectives and procedures for the student teaching experiences of the students assigned to the Center.

Unique to the West Virginia M-STEP Center was the effort to combine and utilize the resources and special characteristics of five teacher preparation institutions with diversity of purpose, program, and personnel. Educational resources of five colleges, a public school system, and the West Virginia State Department of Education were united. Many of the responsibilities normally carried out by directors of student teaching and by college supervisors were assumed by the coordinator of the Center. Activities such as the assignment of student teachers, liaison with cooperating institutions, and many supervisory functions became responsibilities of the coordinator.

The purpose of the Pilot Center was to develop an organizational or administrative framework within which the cooperating agencies could combine their resources, both human and physical, in order to provide a better quality student teaching experience for students from each institution. Two purposes are included in the preceding statement. One, the development of an organizational or administrative framework, is process oriented. The other, a better quality student teaching experience, is product oriented.

The primary emphasis of the Pilot Center was centered on process. While every effort was made to provide a higher quality student teaching experience for each student, it was a basic assumption of those involved in the Pilot Center that effective student teaching experience would be a result of the improved process. In other words, the limitations and restraints to quality student teaching programs found elsewhere in the nation would continue to inhibit the production of a better quality program. An organizational framework or pattern that would permit the cooperating agencies to combine their resources in a more effective way was the goal. The Pilot Center achieved this goal.

An example of the kind of process lacking in most student teaching programs is a process for improving the skills of supervising teachers. A systematic approach to this problem was developed by establishing an intensive inservice program for supervising teachers. Through the Center it was possible to coordinate the resources of the cooperating agencies and to make an inservice education program possible. As a full partner in this enterprise, the Kanawha County school system provided released time for teachers to engage in inservice training. The teacher education institutions and the State Department made their faculties and consultant personnel available to the Center.

The Pilot Center provided the organizational process or vehicle for bringing to student seminars the best talent available in the cooperating agencies, for making these same people available to do intensive classroom supervision when needed, for consultant help to supervising teachers with specific needs, and for channeling feedback from all sources into improved program.

Problems and Pitfalls

It is incorrect to conclude that the transition from a Pilot Center under M-STEP to a Multi-Institutional Teacher Education Center was pain-

less and without difficulty. Opposition to launching a broad-ranged program of teacher education was heard from the college campus, from people who feared the loss of authority and control over what had been essentially their province. Officials in the public schools voiced concern that they were committing themselves to a program which was not primarily in their sphere of interest. There was the question of the legality and wisdom of county schools spending tax money for pre-service teacher education.

There was apprehension expressed that a new, quasi-independent agency could not be held accountable for the quality of the program since it was not under the direct jurisdiction of either colleges or public schools but was responsible to an advisory committee composed of representatives of each. Finally, there had been no historical precedent for a state department of education becoming directly and permanently involved with something such as a local program of inservice education and laboratory experiences for students of teaching.

However, the injection of strong leadership on the part of a few visionary people in positions of authority, including the deans and presidents of all colleges involved, the county superintendent of schools, and the director of teacher preparation for the State Department of Education prevailed. Because they seemed to be convinced that the potential benefits to be derived from such a program far outweighed the pitfalls, the guidelines were expanded and new fiscal and authoritative relationships were designed which enabled the program to expand into what it has become today.

These dynamic leaders predicted that at least the following results would occur:

1. That the public schools have a responsible role to play in the professional development of prospective teachers
2. That coordination of the student teaching program within a public school system will eliminate many overlapping activities of the school system and the colleges that place student teachers within the system
3. That improved inservice programs for supervising teachers will result in more desirable laboratory experiences for student teachers
4. That through cooperative sharing of experiences, the unique characteristics inherent in each cooperating institution will yield a better prepared teacher
5. That an increased awareness of the importance of professional laboratory experiences in the preparation of teachers can be demonstrated by all members of the profession
6. That the clinical supervising teacher be recognized, through appropriate measures, as a superior teacher, one who is committed to the improvement of the profession
7. That involvement at all levels, public schools, higher education, and the state, is necessary for continuous professional development of beginning teachers.

Implications and Projections

The MITEC model of teacher education may have implications as a statewide plan, or may be applicable in a heavily populated school district where several institutions of higher learning compete for the placement of student teachers. It may work equally as well with one university and a school district. Each state or region contemplating a cooperative teacher education program may discover numerous ways the MITEC model could be adapted to meet its particular needs. It is not intended that this model be the panacea in teacher education. It is a flexible structure and, as such, can serve as a springboard for multiple emerging programs.

At this point, it may be helpful to the reader who is considering such a program to see what developments have mushroomed as a result of the modest beginnings of a cooperative venture in teacher education partnership.

Upon completion of the M-STEP program in 1968, the county was convinced the center concept was reaping benefits to the school system, to the teachers, and most important, to boys and girls who were the recipients of more individualized and humanized learning experiences. The State Department of Education saw the Center as a vehicle for strengthening its leadership role and as a way of organizing a statewide focus on teacher education. However, several pressing questions remained to plague the Advisory Committee. Could one person coordinate a program which would now include 500 students of teaching instead of the 25 in the pilot project? With no federal funds, how could such a program be financed? Would one agency gain control and dominate or dictate policy? It was one thing for the college to relinquish five students to a pilot program, but would the individual college staffs support a total student teaching program?

All were apprehensive. The colleges were the most reluctant. Tradition and "ivy tower" complex were evidenced, but here was a new era in teacher education and an opportunity to cooperate. Finally, commitment to partnership was sealed. Detailed description of institutional responsibilities and expanding roles are described in Chapter III.

It is possible through MITEC for students of teaching from participating colleges to enter the teacher education program at various levels on a continuum. For example, a college sophomore, called a college-based aide, may spend one-half day a semester at a Learning Laboratory Center for his entry into teaching. He may spend eight weeks at an elementary learning laboratory and eight weeks at a secondary one, thus giving him the opportunity to work with and learn about children at all developmental stages. College-based teacher educators would act as consultants in this program and would work with the clinical professor, the highest level of school-based teacher educator, in advising and prescribing theory and experience modules in both the school and community for student teachers at various levels. Graduated, sequential basic modules of experience ranging from observation, to individual tutoring, to small group instruction are provided in addition to

optional experience modules. These include creative planning, development of materials, and special interest modules. At the completion of the college-based aide's training, he would discover, through experience, the level of teaching he prefers and the specialized area he may wish to pursue. He may decide if he really should continue in teacher education or should explore other avenues in the world of work.

The flexibility and individualization of MITEC programs at Learning Laboratory Centers permit colleges to design three year undergraduate curricula for students of teaching who could successfully complete competence-based modules. It is also anticipated that some students may need more than four years. Associate teams provide guidance and continuous feedback to students of teaching on their progress and performance. Teacher education programs in schools identified as learning laboratories are designed to permit development of learning experiences in three basic areas: psychological, social, and cultural.

MITEC has developed a handbook which describes the roles and responsibilities of all participating members. The handbook, like the total program, is in a constant state of revision to demonstrate the ever-changing needs and growth of MITEC. A special book of materials, designed principally by students of teaching, records their teaching experiences and shares their thoughts on teaching with others.

The Center has prepared a brochure for parents and the community to explain the program and to invite them to be active participants of MITEC. A brochure of optional enrichment modules is also available. A 16mm film about the Center is being shown upon request to colleges and school systems throughout the country. A 35mm slide-tape narration is also available and has been used at the diffusion center at the National American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and at the World Assembly of International Council on Education for Teaching.

MITEC's philosophy is to share ideas and materials within the Center, the state, and the nation. It strives to give young people greater opportunities for learning, and teachers more options for expanding their repertoire of teaching skills and techniques.

Each college and university participating in the cooperative Multi-Institutional Teacher Education Center is encouraged to maintain and develop its unique autonomy and to create its own innovative programs within the Center structure. Some of the common threads woven into MITEC's program include:

1. Each participating college and university agrees to have students of teaching take part in the orientation week at the beginning of school, regardless of its own school calendar. This experience provides orientation to the school district, to the Learning Laboratory Centers, and to the Multi-Institutional Teacher Education Center.
2. The Advisory Committee works cooperatively to develop common evaluation forms for students of teaching progress. They are developed objectively and on a competence-based performance.
3. Continuous evaluation strengthens the program and adds new dimensions and new direction to MITEC's structure.

4. The Advisory Committee agrees on recognition and honoraria for clinical supervising teachers. All colleges agree, thus eliminating competition and discord.
5. The role of the colleges in the cooperative Center shifts from supervising students to that of consulting, counseling, and providing inservice programs to MITEC participants.

Learning Laboratories facilitate the talents and resources of the entire body of the multi-institutional consortium. Through the laboratories, the door is open to MITEC for continuous educational programs cooperatively developed by the colleges and public schools. Individuals or groups of students of teaching may write their own programs. For example, they may:

1. Prepare programs for specialists as are needed in differentiated staffing
2. Design programs in response to "acceleration of change" and relevance
3. Develop programs in cultural areas to work with inner-city, Appalachian, exceptional, or early childhood students.

MITEC provides professional development for all, inservice for pre- and beginning teachers, and enrichment programs for experienced teachers.

Chapter II

LEARNING LABORATORY CENTERS

Originally, the MITEC program sought to place students of teaching with the best available clinical supervising teachers, no matter where they were located in the county it serves. The colleges and the county accepted this policy because they reasoned that if the teacher was competent, the student of teaching would receive more effective training. Concern for the philosophy of the principal and other staff members was not considered in the original selection. Student teachers were usually placed just as they are in hundreds of other counties in the nation.

The first concern that was expressed by MITEC focused upon the question of training teachers for team teaching assignments. Consequently, MITEC began to look for situations in which teams of teachers were working together and where they could include as members of the team, albeit junior members, the students of teaching.

At the elementary level this meant placing student teachers in schools where whole wings were built without walls and large groups of children, 60-100, were assigned to two, three, or four teachers. Such "pods" were ungraded in the sense that patterns of multi-age and multi-level grouping and regrouping were employed by the teachers. As a student of teaching moved into such "pods," he observed several teaching styles, gained experience in large and small group instruction, and was given an opportunity to prepare and present individually prescribed instructional experiences. Such "pods" were frequently staffed by teachers of differing backgrounds and experience. Thus, the student of teaching learned to adjust to various types of individuals and was not subjected to the one-to-one relationship of student teacher-supervising teacher.

At the secondary level students were frequently assigned to department level teams or teams of teachers working in a single subject area. The student of teaching was expected to carry a full student teaching responsibility, moving as rapidly as possible from observer to preparer,

to presenter, to instructional manager. The scheme proved to be more successful where the entire team perceived teacher education as an important professional responsibility.

Moreover, there was a growing awareness that the factors which affect the learning of the student of teaching are more extensive than the classroom itself or the immediate associates of the student of teaching. The factors which influenced his attitude toward teaching and toward what it means to be professionally competent often lie in subtle contacts the student of teaching makes in the school with staff members not involved in the teacher education program. This additional factor led to MITEC's second concern: that simply reorganizing a teaching staff into teams and providing for multi-age grouping does not ensure a prevailing philosophy of education in which a commitment to experimentation and research is made. Dean Robert Schaefer had described this kind of school as "an institution characterized by a pervasive search for meaning and rationality in its work. Fundamentally, such a school requires that teachers be freed to inquire into the nature of what and how they are teaching." *

In this innovative school setting, a full range of professional and nonprofessional people engage in the pursuit of knowledge about how schools should operate. There is no predisposition to do things as they have always been done. This is replaced by a conviction that learning is the central focus of all activity in the school and that all persons who become involved in the program are, first and foremost, learners. This tenet places teaching in a changing role as the teacher becomes a facilitator of learning.

A second basic tenet of the school which serves as an ideal setting for teacher education is that students and teachers function better when they have a closer understanding of one another, their mutual goals and objectives, via more personal contact and informal relationships. As people move freely back and forth between the role of student and teacher, the understanding of personal feelings about their roles is enhanced and chances for one frustrating the goals of the other are significantly reduced.

In such an experimental school setting, a great many trainees can be admitted to the program. They team up with regular staff members so that the students who are sophomores, juniors, or seniors in college can learn from experienced teachers in actual classroom situations.

There is a serious need for an organic link between the colleges and public schools in the business of teacher education. This link has been built by the medical profession as doctors of medicine move freely from practitioner to teacher in a training hospital. The concept is mutually beneficial to both the hospital, its patients, and the students who study medicine at several professional and paraprofessional levels. It is this model which MITEC has selected in building a relationship between the college it serves and the teacher training centers.

*Robert Schaefer, *The School as the Center of Inquiry*. New York: Harper and Row, 1967, p. 3.

Schools as Learning Laboratory Centers are designed to make maximum use of interior space for instructional purposes. They are usually open space designs, permitting great flexibility through movable learning center stations which serve as partitions for various learning activities. The architectural planning for the laboratory centers focuses on providing modifiability through modular design.

The modern Learning Laboratory Centers are available for a variety of community and extra-school uses. Such use includes recreation programs, community library services, cultural activities, and programs of remediation and enrichment in all instructional areas for all age groups, including adults.

Although each Learning Laboratory Center develops its own philosophy, a basic philosophy was established through committees and subcommittees composed of representative members from the Kanawha County central administrative staff, principals, classroom teachers, community, colleges, and state department. There were also representatives from the adjoining state of Ohio. The Committee worked for two years prior to the opening of the Learning Laboratory Centers to find new ways of involving, using, and developing the resource components that go into an educational program. It was felt that: (1) New ways must be found to involve parents in the determination of the educational program of their children and in the continuing assessment of the children's success and failure; (2) An individual student's educational program should be tailor-made to meet the individual's needs and aspirations. Thus, not only would the student be involved in determining his program, but a definite portion of his total time spent in school would be devoted to activities that were generated by him; (3) Time should be devoted within the regular school day for humanizing and socializing activities that would guide the student into becoming aware of his own social and psychological needs.

The Committee viewed the role of the teacher as being different from the role of the teacher in a traditional school. The teacher must abdicate the focal point position, become involved as a co-worker with students, and become a motivator—the guide—the lending hand—the advisor—the consultant—the planner—and a source of encouragement.

To accomplish these idealistic teacher-student related goals, the Committee felt that the teachers who volunteered for this school must be aware of and in sympathy with the established philosophical and educational goals of the school and be committed to their development. It was further suggested that these teachers be committed to, and provisions be made for, both pre-service and inservice training.

Community aides, college aides, clinical professors, and students of teaching contribute to the differentiated staffing patterns of the centers. Teacher education resource centers are integral parts of the Learning Laboratories and are housed in specific areas. The resource center contains films, filmstrips, games, books, pamphlets, and simulation materials on teacher education. Special viewing centers and studios

for video-taping and micro-teaching facilities are a part of the center. This arrangement provides a laboratory setting for the study of teaching. Pre-service and inservice become one in a continuous educational setting where associate teams work together to analyze and explore ways of teaching/learning that evoke excitement and interest in children in a creative atmosphere.

Newsletters, question-answer booklets, television programs, and personal letters keep parents and the community informed and in touch with the Learning Laboratories. A special dial system in one center permits persons to call the school and hear a recording of all activities taking place for that particular week. They may dial still another number and ask questions concerning the school. These questions will be recorded and answered at a later time.

Each teacher, administrator, and student of teaching in the Learning Laboratory is assigned as a counselor to a group of boys and girls. The "counselor" contacts the parents of each member of his group every month to establish personal contacts between home and school, to invite parents to visit the center or to do volunteer services, and to report on the child's progress. The Learning Laboratory Centers seek to give individual students a wide range of experiences within and beyond all curricular areas. These experiences, under the general guidance of the instructional staff, will largely be generated by the student himself.

Chapter III

INSTITUTIONAL LINKAGES IN COOPERATIVE CENTERS

Colleges and Universities

It is appropriate at this point to examine in more detail the ways the various components are linked together in the operation of MITEC. In describing the attempt to develop a cooperative center for teacher education, the metaphor "the long road to partnership" has been chosen. The metaphor of a road has a number of implications which make it useful in describing processes in which MITEC has engaged and which should prove provocative for others wishing to establish cooperative centers. The metaphor of a road suggests a starting point, a destination, and a series of intermediate stops along the way. The metaphor also suggests that one arrives at the destination only through effort and after a period of time. Finally, it suggests that some will not complete the trip and that different travelers will require different amounts of time.

One should try to visualize a long road which has its origins with a group of colleges and public school systems coming together with a common purpose: to improve all aspects of teacher education. Set One identifies six areas of cooperation which the colleges of MITEC have achieved.

SET ONE

1. Placement of Student Teachers
2. Selection of Clinical Supervising Teachers
3. Designing Inservice Programs for Teachers
4. Establishing General Guidelines Evaluating Student Teachers
5. Coordination of Pre-Student Teaching Laboratory Experiences
6. Cooperative Offering of Special Methods Course

The road into the future will lead to the achievement of additional areas of cooperation. The colleges of MITEC are at different levels of implementation in Set Two.

SET TWO

1. Yielding Supervising of Student Teachers to School-Based Teacher Educators
2. Establishing Minimum Expectations for Prospective Student Teachers
3. Cooperative Planning of Syllabi for Special Methods Courses
4. Establishment of Internship Experiences after College Graduation
5. Cooperative Licensure of College Graduates

Each of the steps along the road represents a decision which must be made in moving further from institutional autonomy to greater partnership of a cooperative center. The design establishes two different but related kinds of cooperation. It is not assumed that the only problem in cooperation is between colleges and the public schools. In establishing a cooperative center, it is also necessary to build links of participation between the colleges themselves, since colleges have always been fortresses of sovereignty.

In general, the model suggests that the first set of decisions include such important but relatively mechanical matters as placing student teachers and selecting clinical supervising teachers. Normally, the former decision has been one which each college has worked out with a school or a school system. The latter decision has been one which public schools have generally arrogated to themselves, perhaps jawboning with the colleges on the matter and perhaps working under some general guidelines from the state department of education. The destination in the model is the point where colleges, public schools, and state departments of education agree on which college graduates are to receive teaching licenses. Normally that has been a college function, working under guidelines of varying specificity from state departments of education. Typically public schools have had no real participation in that decision.

The first set of decisions are those which most cooperative centers will be able to make without undue stress or delay. The second set of decisions are those which truly involve the pooling of sovereignty. Those decisions should be hard fought in the hope that the process of negotiation will itself constitute a long term gain for the cooperating institutions. It is believed that true partnership can only be considered possible when institutions have moved to the second set of decisions.

For a number of reasons student teaching seems to be a difficult area for reaching decisions. The study of change in educational institutions suggests that a less sensitive, perhaps somewhat indirect approach to decision-making will be fruitful. The institutions in MITEC recognize this problem and have decided to concentrate on decision-making in two areas that are somewhat less locked in than student teaching. Specifically they are pre-student teaching laboratory experiences and special methods courses.

One route chosen by MITEC to expedite decision-making is to concentrate on coordination of pre-student teaching laboratory experiences. The plan is to employ a professional, in much the same way that

AACTE employs associate secretaries to give attention to coordination of these laboratory experiences. Drawing on work of member colleges and public schools, this coordinator will establish centers for the activities, objectives for the programs, an evaluation system, and a series of inservice education activities for clinical supervising teachers. The coordinator, hired with funds from the public school system, the colleges, and the State Department of Education, will provide coordination in making these decisions.

The area of special methods courses provides another unusual opportunity for developing cooperative decisions.* The plan of MITEC is to begin first with cooperation among the several colleges. This is to be done through the cooperative offering of special methods courses, with responsibility for development and implementation of specific courses among the colleges. The colleges will eventually work in cooperative planning with the public schools and the State Department of Education with the expectation that the courses will be offered in Learning Laboratory Centers in the public schools. At that point the groups concerned will establish syllabi for the courses, including objectives and evaluation techniques, and will offer these courses to be taught by school-based teacher educators.

For MITEC these detours are promising possibilities for developing cooperation. Generally the colleges have no strong tradition in prestudent teaching laboratory experiences so that they can all begin in an area that has not become institutionalized. As for special methods courses, financial consideration make it desirable for colleges to cooperate, and cooperation of any kind is the first step toward implementation of effective programs.

MITEC envisions the establishment of a program of internship beyond the student teaching experience. Typically, colleges at the end of four years have abrogated responsibility for inducting new teachers into the profession. It is suggested that the establishment of internship, following internship but prior to licensure, will involve new roles and responsibilities for the institutions of higher education, the public school systems, state departments of education, and the united educational professions. This decision lies well in the future for MITEC, but the MITEC model would be incomplete without this stated intention of working to develop an internship.

Finally, it is anticipated that the licensing of college graduates will become a joint responsibility of the members of the cooperative center. It does not seem unreasonable to MITEC that those parties bearing responsibility for the development of teachers should also share in the authority to license prospective candidates. Once again it is obvious that the united educational professions and state departments of education will share in this authority with the colleges and public schools.

The selection of student teachers and clinical teachers should be brought under the control of written guidelines, preferably guidelines

*Huber M. Walsh, "Let's Move the Methods Courses off Campus." *The Journal of Teacher Education*, 21: 347-351, Fall 1970.

built in cooperation with the State Department of Education. These two crucial facts of teacher training are frequently underestimated in the process of building cooperative centers. Implicit in any of the decisions is the notion of a veto power to be exercised by any of the three cooperating groups. Once having made vehicles for these decisions, cooperating centers will find it necessary to pay continuing attention to the decisions. Since these first steps are the basis upon which cooperation is to be built, it is important that all groups find common agreement on selection and placement.

The inservice programs are an easy vehicle for welding cooperation between public schools and colleges and between colleges and colleges. The inservice programs represent a lessening of the sovereignty of public schools over the inservice development of their teachers. The general guidelines for student teachers work in the other direction; they lessen the sovereignty of colleges over the evaluation of student teachers. Further, the general guidelines for evaluating student teachers can and should involve the State Department of Education. Certainly at this point it is not implied that colleges have yielded their authority in supervising and grading student teachers.

The yielding of supervision of student teachers either to public school personnel or to school-based educators on the staff of both public school and college must be considered. When and if such a step is taken, the role of the colleges in teacher education will change. The residual role of the colleges, as envisioned by MITEC, is presented later in this publication. Corollary to yielding supervision is the establishment of minimum expectations for students entering the teaching profession. If colleges and public schools are to change their roles in this basic supervision, then it seems advisable for them to establish minimum expectations for students entering the student teaching experience.* Minimum expectations are the guarantee made to all participants that the colleges have carried out their obligations to the center.

Assuming for the moment that MITEC or any other cooperative center can achieve the desired partnership suggested, what remains for institutions of higher education? For one answer to this question, please refer to "Levels of Involvement: A Descriptive Theory Model for Teacher Education," at the end of this section.

The preparation of a professional teacher involves progression from typical classroom settings through contrived settings to those which are more realistic and less controlled. Assuming for the moment the validity of this model, one can conclude that the role of a college lies practically in Levels 1, 2, and 3. There is reason to believe that colleges will need much of the manpower and resources currently used in student teaching to enrich their offerings at these three levels.

Beginning at Level 4 in the model, the participatory element becomes paramount. Level 4, at least in its structural elements, corresponds to what has commonly been called pre-student teaching laboratory experi-

*Kenneth Benne, ed., *The Planning of Change*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969 (2nd edition).

ences. Under the concept of a cooperative center, college expense in manpower and resources will decrease at Level 4 and also at Level 5, the student teaching experience. The resources saved at these levels can then be recycled into Levels 1, 2, and 3. Please note that it is not anticipated that the colleges will abandon activities at Levels 4, 5, and beyond. The contrary is more nearly true, but the type of involvement in terms of manpower will change in the designated directions.

In this section will be found the plan for involving the colleges in a true partnership with other agencies in teacher education. The set of decisions which are to be made in traveling the long road to partnership have been described. When teacher education in the MITEC region has changed in the directions indicated, the role of the colleges will be seen to correspond to the activities suggested by Levels 1, 2, and 3. It is anticipated that cooperation among colleges and other agencies in the consortium will touch all segments of the teacher education program. However, in this section an attempt has been made to show where primary responsibility for the various segments of the program will lie.

Seven Levels of Involvement: A Descriptive Theory Model for Teacher Education

1. Reception-Comprehension Level
   Typical Classroom and Classroom-Related Activities:
   - lecture
   - reading
   - discussion
   - previewing
2. Extended Classroom Settings/Extrapolation
   Low Level Applications of Classroom Materials:
   - protocol materials (e.g. classroom interaction sequences with an interaction analysis system)
   - other training materials (e.g. "Critical Moments" films from Indiana University)
   - observations in classrooms (e.g. coding classroom interaction, analysis of teacher's reinforcement structure, analysis of teacher's planning skills)
   - written problems (e.g. books of teaching problems)
3. Contrived Settings
   High Level Application of Classroom Material in Approximations to Real Settings:
   - role playing
   - simulation
   - simulation games
4. Real Settings: Strictly Controlled*
   College Student Engaged in Real Teaching Activities of Highly Structured Nature or Diminished Size:
   - microteaching
   - tutoring
   - student aide work: teaching a single lesson

- student aide work: teaching a series of controlled lessons
- student aide work: working with one student or small group

5. Real Settings: Partially Controlled
   College Student Engaged as Teacher in Full Classroom Setting with Designated Supervisor(s) Normally Present:
   - traditional student teaching activity
   - practice teaching activity
6. Real Settings: Loosely Controlled
   College Students Engaged as Paid Teacher with Designated Supervisor Not Normally Present:
   - internship
   - internship with team teaching
7. Real Settings: Autonomous
   Former College Student Engaged as Paid Teacher with Ultimate Responsibility for Classroom:
   - fulltime teacher: self-contained classroom
   - fulltime teacher: team teaching situation

Note: These situations can be at peer level or at superior-subordinate level, as long as they are real and not role playing activities.

School Systems

Teacher education today needs a setting where new concepts can be developed and instructional strategies can be applied. Such a setting is supplied by the school districts where students of teaching can be free to develop their creative potential. These settings must be humanized Learning Laboratory Centers which synthesize total commitment of resources, cooperation of personnel, and implementation of the best in educational theory and instruction.

The evolvement of public schools into Learning Laboratory Centers reflects the bold multi-dimensional thrust currently being adopted in the quest for superior approaches to prepare teachers for the real world. Since schools are the WHY for teacher education, as learning centers they will be a potent force in exerting the distinctive stimuli needed to cause other partners to join with renewed vigor and purpose in making education of real value for all students.

This new cooperative approach designed to facilitate quality education requires a commitment by the school districts to provide adequate educational facilities; enthusiastic, innovative staffs; and human and financial resources.

Therefore, continuing the root metaphor of the long road to partnership, as illustrated by the involvement of the colleges, the emerging role of the school district as another indispensable link in this collaborative educational effort will be interpreted.

Moving from a public school autonomy to new roles of shared sovereignty in a cooperative teacher education center precludes achieving productive change in teacher education. Consequently, attention must be given to all components involved in the decision-making process.

The need is urgent for classroom teachers to be included in establishing and implementing teacher education programs. Otherwise the credibility gap will continue to widen among the most crucial variable in the classroom-the teachers. Teachers are demanding a voice in the making of decisions concerning organizational structures and standards for teacher preparation; defining lines of responsibility for school systems, colleges, and education associations; and clarification of qualifications and functions of personnel involved in teacher preparation.*

Accordingly, the initial planning for a cooperative center must include representatives from all those who will be affected by the program: students, teachers, principals, school district personnel, college-based educators, and community representatives. Thus, open commitments and mutual respect among the managers in the critical areas of service, staffing, and finance will help pave the road to relevant teacher education.

For too long school districts have not taken major positions on what students of teachers and their supervisors should be like and what they should know and do. In the new cooperative spirit, this passive role is no longer acceptable. It is only through the collaboration of schools and colleges that humane teachers and a humane curriculum for today's students can be developed.

Further, the collaboration of schools and colleges is especially essential in improving the process of education. It is not possible to examine and experiment with teaching in a school setting without influencing the school program and the personnel. The people with the power in schools and colleges need to *believe* that a joint venture in teacher education will be mutually profitable.

The college-based teacher educators, clinical professors, and principals must feel it is their responsibility to follow appropriate and approved practices which effectively help the student of teaching. Collectively, they will make available those educational experiences which will enable the student to make a smooth transition from educational theory into the practicalities of teaching.

In the beginning of MITEC, the school system was invited to be a partner in a new kind of teacher education in which schools would have deeper commitment and involvement in upgrading teacher education. This would be particularly significant in the pre-student teaching laboratory experiences.

Committees of teachers, principals, and college representatives met regularly to design guidelines on (1) experiences students of teaching should have, (2) roles and responsibilities of all cooperating agencies, (3) cooperative sponsorship of inservice programs for students of teaching, (4) intensive inservice for supervising teachers, and (5) evaluation of the program.

Since there were several teacher training institutions in the area, a need for coordinating educational resources and devising common

*"Classroom Teachers Speak on the Classroom Teacher in the Student Teaching Program," Association of Classroom Teachers, National Education Association. Washington, D. C., 1970. pp. 4-5

guidelines was recognized. It was further recognized that an agency was needed to facilitate placement of students of teaching and to help them adjust to the realities of practical application of their educational experiences.

In the MITEC approach, college administrators and school administrators have allocated time and effort to make collaboration work. Further, through MITEC the role of the public school is coordinated with the institutions of higher learning, each sharing the responsibility for the training of prospective teachers.

Identification of the flexible, open schools where learning occurs in a humanistic atmosphere is one of the most important decisions to be made. Six learning centers, illustrating collaborative effort at its best, represent the linkage between the college-based program and the public schools. These centers are utilized in the continuing education of preservice and inservice teachers. The community, the principals, and the faculties of these centers benefit from the delineating of new roles, responsibilities, and educational procedures.

Advantages which may result from this partnership are many. One of the first is staff improvement which will ultimately help solve many of the ills of today's schools. Responsibility for cooperative staff selection provides an opportunity to view prospective teachers in action and to select the best potential candidates for educating students. Staff improvement will begin with the classroom teacher.

In the learning center, aspiring future teachers work and learn with principals and cooperating teachers who are believers in the worth and dignity of individual people, who share delight in learning along with the learners, and who strive to develop self-directed, independent learners. The intense, personal relationship between pupil and educator underlies the urgent need for teachers who have special qualifications and characteristics. Careful screening by school and college administrations and personnel of the learning centers as a cooperative effort will increase the possibilities for locating these teachers.

In order to stay abreast of what students need, teachers improve their competencies through inservice, utilizing the expertise of college-based educators and consultants available from the school system. Another benefit is the opportunity to pool cooperative ideas in the areas of staff differentiation and improve individualized instruction for both pupils and students of teaching.

Teachers become more innovative as they teach in a living laboratory setting where an experimental climate is fostered. Teaching results can be appraised through self evaluation, through team evaluation by student teachers and other teachers, and through research studies.

Clinical experiences are implemented in the Learning Laboratory Centers by the clinical professor and the team of clinical supervising teachers. MITEC allows sufficient flexibility to adapt the program of clinical experiences to the particular needs of each student of teaching.

The availability of schools for conducting research is made possible by Learning Laboratory Centers. This research, in turn, becomes an

important link in giving direction to relevant improvements in educational philosophy and procedures in teacher preparation.

Good teacher training programs are costly. Who will share the financial burden of compensating clinical coordinators and teachers, travel of supervisory personnel, informational and study materials, inservice workshops, and evaluation clinics?

Perhaps the first step is for colleges and schools to review their budget priorities in light of their commitment to teacher education. This would possibly necessitate a mutual commitment to channel maximum available funds into the teacher training program.

In addition, when relevant, meaningful educational programs are convincingly administered, the public will be sympathetic in supporting fund allocations for continued implementation and improvement. This points out the need for school systems to have a strong line of communication with the public to keep them aware of the needs and objectives of teacher training education. Concentrated persuasion from educational and public liaisons will provide leverage for legislative support for funds. Until sufficient federal funds are forthcoming, however, the underwriting of the cost of major innovations in teacher preparation improvement must remain the responsibility of the state government.

The funding of MITEC is shared by the school system, participating colleges, and the State Department of Education. In addition, the school system provides resource consultants, academic specialists, and the headquarters for MITEC. Most importantly, the school system provides the innovative schools which are the Learning Laboratory Centers. This huge commitment of the public school system places it as an indispensable link in the teacher education preparation program.

Can the components of dynamic, cooperative thinking and planning between the school system and colleges by synthesized into an eclectic approach for improving teacher education? Through MITEC, the school systems in West Virginia are rising to meet the challenge with an emphatic answer of "Yes!"

Professional Link

American education has been searching for a new definition of professionalism. For years the teaching profession has been laboring with some practices which are professionally unsound. Now the attempt is being made to discard practices such as (1) anyone can teach if he has the book the night before, (2) the beginning teacher is as effective as he will be after twenty years of teaching, or (3) teachers who wish to progress in the profession must be promoted to positions away from the classroom.

> If the profession is to acquire and maintain the intellectual strength and the political power necessary in these times, a new concept of the profession must be created. This concept must include new structures and functions – in short, a professional entity.*

*Smith, B. O., *Teachers for the Real World*. Washington, D. C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1970, p. 136.

As college faculties and public school personnel interact with one another in planning programs of undergraduate teacher education, a new understanding of the meaning of professionalism has emerged. Dialogue concerning responsibilities and obligations has fostered a new understanding of what it means to be a professional educator. A center, when based upon sound theoretical constructs and pointed in the direction of opening channels of communication, can serve as a means whereby continuous professional development of educators can occur.

In Chapter IV, descriptions are given for a number of new roles which the Center hopes to facilitate and several which are in the process of emerging, one in particular being that of the school-based teacher educator. It has long been recognized that if teachers are to continue to be competent, professional education and training must be continuous. There must be opportunity at a number of different points in a teacher's career for him to make choices about what he will become. If the only option open to him is a move into full time administration and if he elects not to move in this direction, must he remain a classroom teacher with no change in status and responsibility? Through the Center, outstanding teachers have been given another option, that of becoming school-based teacher educators. As a person responsible for directing the laboratory phase of the student teacher's education within a school, this person is both college teacher and public school teacher. The nature of his professional commitment is altered as he subjects his own teaching to scrutiny by others who are studying to become teachers. The school-based teacher educator is one of those rare people in the profession who must be able both to teach effectively and to discuss teaching methods with others. The task is not simple, but it has caused individuals to become more "professional."

The control of teacher education has for years been left to the colleges and state departments of education. As the national movements toward professional autonomy have gained momentum, the Center has begun discussing ways it can serve as a vehicle for giving the professions a stronger voice in determining who will become a teacher. In the past, the accent has been upon performance criteria for undergraduate training with the colleges exercising control through designing the behavioral objectives and establishing minimum performance levels. Through the Center the possibility exists that a set of standards can be designed which will be mutually acceptable to the colleges, the state department, the public schools, and the professions. In this way the united profession may become more active in the final acceptance of a candidate for licensure.

Such a final step to professional licensure might require the candidates to teach one year in a MITEC school as an intern teacher. During this year the intern teacher would receive direction and guidance from professional staff members designated for this purpose. Upon completion of the intern year, an evaluation of the candidate's work would

be forwarded to the state board of professional licensure. This evaluation would determine whether or not a license was granted. It would be incumbent on the profession to develop guidelines and professional practices for the intern's experience. In this way the licensure of teacher candidates would be based upon a final performance evaluation rather than a college recommendation and a candidate's college transcript.

Community Link

If the goal of education is to prepare students for the real world, the real world must become involved in educating students. The community is indeed the real world, the maker and molder of our students. This, then, is the rationale for the community's linkage with the MITEC program.

> There has been an almost revolutionary change in the relationship between school and community. Traditionally, it was the school that made educational plans, interpreted them to the community and then tried to use the community as a resource in achieving educational goals. Today, an increasing number of communities want to participate actively in formulating educational plans. They want to communicate these hopes to the school and use the school's resources in achieving the community's goals.*

The school out of step with its community finds itself out of step with the real world. Community involvement, an important component of the linkage model, should not only be made available to students of teaching but should be studied and encouraged.

The community which plays a prominent role in the diagnosing, planning, and subsequent evaluation of the school's educational program and provides the school with service volunteers and resource persons is by the very nature of these involvements interested in teacher education. These three levels of community participation are in operation in the Learning Laboratory Centers. A brief overview of the functions of each level is presented to show how students of teaching are involved with these groups.

The first level of involvement includes parents in a process of diagnosing, planning, and evaluating the educational program. Beginning in the late spring of each year, selected members of the staff, including a student of teaching, meet with parents in small, informal discussion groups for the purpose of establishing a continuing interchange of information regarding the needs of their children. At these meetings, parents are invited to share in determining the educational program for their child.

A student of teaching finds this type of experience valuable as it provides him not only the opportunity to meet and plan with parents, but gives him insight into some of the aspirations parents have for their children's educational experiences. He observes how school and community work together to accommodate the needs and interests of children. Thus, he can more accurately determine how effectively the

*Ibid., p. 96.

needs of individuals are being met in the Learning Laboratory Center and his role in helping to meet these needs.

The second level of involvement includes community volunteers, persons who are willing to serve in the school on a scheduled basis each week, assisting primarily with non-instructional tasks. On initial contact with the Learning Laboratory Center, the student of teaching may select modules of experience similar to those activities in which the community volunteer engages. By performing the same tasks, he becomes acquainted with the community persons.

A fundamental tenet of the Learning Laboratory Center is that members of the community make significant contributions to the educational program by acting as resource persons available on an on-call basis. Because people are not ordinarily accustomed to being regarded as resource persons, this auxiliary is created through personal contacts by school personnel.

Students of teaching, when added to the school staff, provide yet another source of information and aid in building the resource group. If the student of teaching is a member of the community, he is especially valuable in this area. Not only does he know capable resource persons who would be of benefit to the school, but also he creates good will toward the school when he invites persons to share their specialties with boys and girls.

On the other hand, many students of teaching will not be familiar with resource persons in the community. They, however, can play an even more important role by getting representatives of the academic disciplines from their respective colleges or universities to act as resource persons.

The most important aspect of the student teacher's involvement with the community is his own role, that of being accepted by the community in which he functions. In the Learning Laboratory Center his role is a vital one, which the community recognizes because its members have observed his performance as they have worked together.

Too many times in the past, community support has been solicited in a haphazard manner without any attempt to analyze the community. "To understand a community, one must know the stresses that are tearing it apart as well as the forces which are keeping it together."*

A careful study must be made to determine the power structure or centers of influence in the community and how these units can best be approached and made an integral part of the school. This seems to be a major task of the school's instructional leader; however, for maximum community commitment, there must be maximum school personnel commitment. Teachers and students of teaching must in fact become skilled in winning and maintaining community support.

This facet of teacher education has too long been neglected and is one that the public school can assume. With communities looking for entry points into their schools, educators are not only going to have to

*Ibid., p. 97.

build the avenues, but they are going to have to police the avenues on a continuing basis to determine whether the traffic is moving into the school. This necessitates a working knowledge of public relations.

Because teachers traditionally do not possess much knowledge in this field, students of teaching may be asked to act as change agents in this vital area. They need to know why the community is invited into the school and what kinds of services each entity can provide for the other. Techniques and methods for gaining community support need also to be practiced.

State Department of Education

The seven-state M-STEP compact was the vehicle by which the West Virginia Department of Education took a more than passing interest in improving teacher education practices in the state. State Board of Education decisions resulted in a Coordinator of Preservice and Continuing Education being employed in the Department whose duties would be to encourage the development of Teacher Education Centers throughout the state.

Since 1966, the Coordinator's responsibilities have been to work with colleges and universities which prepare teachers, the public schools, and the community in the establishment and development of cooperative laboratories for professional experiences for students of teaching, particularly in the provision of clinical experiences. State policies have been adopted which have supported the Center approach; which have provided professional certification policies for supervising teachers as teacher education associates; and which have supported innovative and experimental programs leading to "other" ways of satisfying licensure requirements for students of teaching.

The State Board of Education in West Virginia has sought ways to assist in the development of Centers by supporting legislation designed to enable colleges and public schools to cooperate in the provision of inservice programs for public school and college teacher educators. An organization of college and university directors of student teaching has gathered periodically to exchange views and provide the Department with guidance regarding teacher education practices across the state.

The Board has provided the impetus for attempts to upgrade the supervisory skills of supervising teachers, both in less formal ways and in encouraging supervising teachers to seek the Teacher Education Associate Certificate, an endorsement to a teacher's regular certificate which designates the holder as a recognized colleague in teacher education.

State Board action resulted in the State Legislature earmarking a sum of money for the expansion of the Teacher Education Center concept, three of which already exist in the state: the Mercer County Teacher Education Center, a cooperative teacher center composed of Mercer County public schools and Bluefield and Concord State Colleges, and the Harrison County Teacher Education Center, consisting of the Harrison County public schools and a consortium of six public and

private institutions which prepare teachers, as well as the original MITEC in Kanawha County. Funds budgeted by the Board of Education are not limited to the development of new centers alone, but are to assist in supporting expanded functions of already existing centers.

The State Board of Education policy has recognized joint responsibility for teacher preparation by county school systems and institutions of higher education. It is supportive of this joint concept in establishing policies and regulations.

In West Virginia, the State Board of Education has adopted the approved programs approach to teacher preparation, and provides responsibility for approving such programs in all the state's colleges. It is also responsible for licensure of all professional and service personnel in education, and has adopted such procedures as the Interstate Reciprocity Agreement Pact with twenty-three states in order to provide for "mobility" of teachers. It has, as well, provided for other routes to certification for persons holding baccalureate degrees by approving licensure for persons who obtain satisfactory scores on the National Teacher Examination.

Recent adoption by the state legislature of a plan for early childhood education in West Virginia of those children five years of age and under has caused the State Board of Education to take priority stances in this area. It is envisioned that Early Childhood Demonstration Centers will join with the Teacher Education Centers to provide for broadened opportunities for West Virginia's children. Such a concern for the whole child has caused West Virginia's governor to establish a new agency, the Interagency Council, a concept dedicated to the development of the "whole" child. In supporting the request for Early Education, the education of children aged five and below, programs before the West Virginia Legislature, the governor dedicated this state to the concept of service to the child, not just an "educational" program, but a health program, a mental health program, and a welfare program as well. Accordingly, the governor appointed to an inter-agency council, with himself as chairman, ex-officio, the state director of health, the state director of mental health, the state commissioner of welfare, and the state superintendent of schools. The council seeks ways to adequately provide for the child those services which he needs if he is going to utilize the educational skills which make him a productive member of society.

For some time the State Department of Education in West Virginia has recognized that local effort in public education has not been equal. The State of West Virginia, like many states in the southern tier of the United States, is organized for local educational effort, on a county unit basis. As is usual in most states, the property tax is the base by which local funds are channeled into the support of public education. This results in an inequitable situation in which a "poor" county, one with a minimum taxable base or with little or no industry, is in a less viable position to support public schools than in a larger, wealthier county, perhaps one in which a concentration of industry is located.

The state aids the local effort by means of a formula, recently revised, which attempts to equalize the financial resources on which local educational agencies may depend. In fact, in some instances, the state aid to local school systems may exceed the local effort by far. However, the quality of education a child receives depends to a large extent, in West Virginia as elsewhere, on where that child is born and grows up.

A regional approach to the problem of disequilibrium in educational opportunity in West Virginia has also been enacted. The state has been divided into seven regions for distribution of educational services which one or more particular county units might not be able to implement by its own efforts. The regions are designed in order that at least one state-supported institution of higher education is located in each region to act as a resource center. An individual, designated as Regional Coordinator, is jointly employed by the state supported institutions and the State Department of Education. His duties, basically, are to attempt to provide services and consultation to the county unit of the region, and to facilitate the utilization of services which might be provided by the state institution to the county units of the region.

State funding of the teacher education multi-institutional approach has permitted a broad look at the possibilities of wider public school involvement in the Center approach through a joint, or multi-county arrangement. Public school systems which might not have resources or population bases sufficient to serve as centers for clinical experiences, could well, through the regional approach, attract institutions in joining in the establishment of a Teacher Education Center. Three Multi-County Teacher Education Centers are being implemented in West Virginia in addition to the three Centers described earlier in this section.

All indications point to an acceptance of the philosophy of the co-operative approach to the problems of providing quality clinical experiences for students of teaching, with the corollary benefits attendant for public school staffs being recognized by regional public school personnel. Although certain organizational problems need attention, the regional approach to the development of Teacher Education Centers in West Virginia seems to be gaining favor. In a sense, the thinking seems to be that if institutional cooperation is a good thing, would not county unit cooperation be of even greater value?

Chapter IV

INDIVIDUAL LINKAGES: A DIFFERENTIATED CONSORTIUM

The process of teacher education demands that many individuals assume roles directed toward the emergence of students of teaching. Traditionally these various individual roles were acted out with little or no concern as to their effect on other individuals operating in teacher education. The overlapping, inconsistencies, and conflicts that occur by this haphazard method have had harmful effects not only on the efficiency of a program but also on the quality of the product the program is designed to produce. If the student of teaching does not know what expectations are to be placed on him, or if conflicting behavior changes are expected by various "types" operating in teacher education, he must either behave differently in the presence of the different "types" or make a judgment as to whom he has to please. This places the student of teaching in a very precarious position and is unfair, if not disastrous.

To alleviate the problem of overlapping function, conflicting expectations, and inconsistencies in management of the program, the MITEC concept offers each individual operating within its confines a significantly different role to perform. The Center's function is to allocate individual roles to all personnel of the colleges and public schools who are responsible to the Center for the training of the students of teaching.

Public School Type Roles

Aides

Several factors have contributed to the current emphasis of the use of lay personnel in continuous education programs throughout the country: the unprecedented demands made upon schools; need to improve school-community relations; overcrowded classrooms; paid paraprofessional programs sponsored by federal funds; and the reorganization of the school curricula and patterns of teaching, such as differentiated

team teaching, open-space teaching, learning laboratories, and individualization of instruction. The services of paid and volunteer aides help make possible the successful implementation of these new concepts in education.

Comprehensive innovative programs involving the best theory and practice of modern education are evidenced in MITEC's cooperative laboratory center. In order to achieve important goals of individual self-realization and a love for learning, Kanawha County's Learning Laboratory Centers are committed to a differentiated team teaching plan consisting of integrated educational services wherein professional, paraprofessional, and volunteer educators all play a vital role. This plan recognizes that a child's needs may be met best by a teacher at certain times, by an aide, volunteer, or student of teaching at other times, or by any combination of the persons comprising his teaching team. Again, the concerted effort by several team members working together may help a particular child solve his unique problems.

Aides at Piedmont and other MITEC Learning Laboratory Schools are selected under a Federal Career Opportunities Program providing employment, college preparation at West Virginia State College, and on-the-job training to economically deprived persons. Such persons are community-based and are selected on the basis of personal need and expected contribution to children. It is anticipated that participation in the school program will stimulate their interest in education as a potential career. Over a two-year period an aide may earn an Associate of Arts Degree in Education, or he may transfer to a full four-year Bachelor's Degree program.

The aide is an indispensable member of the teaching team. Working under the direction of a lead teacher or team leader, he shares responsibility for all the students in his team. His duties are defined at two levels. First, general guidelines and policies for the use of aides are followed. Second, the lead teacher guides the aide, specifying responsibilities in terms of ongoing team activities. It seems feasible to categorize the work of the aide as certain routine tasks, which can be carefully described, and as definite instructional tasks according to abilities and interests he possesses or is able to develop. His duties, therefore, include:

- Read to or talk with individuals and small groups of children
- Assist small groups with projects, construction, experiments, and similar active work.
- Play instructional games with small groups; help with individualized activities
- Assist with the preparation of materials for planned activities; distribute materials
- Prepare and arrange bulletin board displays and exhibits
- Operate audiovisual and other equipment
- Accompany teachers and children on fieldtrips
- Contribute to the instructional program in areas of special competence—for example, music

- Supervise students during nonstructured time, cleanup, and outdoor play time
- Help with children's clothing and other belongings
- Prepare the learning area for lunch; help to serve the food
- Assist with records and collect information
- Help individual children with minor problems.*

Volunteers are oriented and specially trained for the tasks they are to perform. Kanawha County provides a general orientation and training program for schools which wish to participate. The remainder of the training is provided by the members of the professional staff with whom the volunteer works. Volunteers are always under the direction and supervision of a member of the professional staff. They are recruited from the community, universities and colleges, local junior and senior high schools, and students from within the school.

Community volunteers work in the schools on a regular basis, generally a half day per week. These volunteers range from adolescents to grandparents. Warmth, maturity, stability, and love for children lead the list of personal qualifications. The tasks of these volunteers vary according to the needs of the particular school, the abilities and interests of the volunteers, and the level on which a volunteer works. However, the services rendered fall into two general categories. One category of services is that of helping to relieve the professional staff of clerical and non-instructional work, and the other is that of providing individual help in the form of instruction to children or to small groups of children. The majority of volunteers feel that working in such a program gives them a better understanding of the operation and problems of the schools. For some it provides a feeling of usefulness outside the home and for others their previous fear of teachers vanishes after having served as a school volunteer.

In addition to the community volunteers who work regularly in the schools, there are a number of people from the community who serve as resource people for special purposes throughout the school year. These volunteers provide enrichment experiences and information for children when they are studying special units of work. Some of the resource volunteers include policemen, firemen, forest rangers, doctors, lawyers, fashion designers, astronauts, and many others. These volunteers gain a better understanding of the school while the program is enriched.

Another source of volunteers comes from the local universities and colleges. Working in the schools is now part of the educational requirements of MITEC colleges and universities. As early as the freshman year, students may work during school hours and in the evenings tutoring students in academic subjects and performing clerical and non-instructional duties for the professional staff. This work provides these volunteers with a deeper insight into their education classes and further orients them to their chosen profession. One value of this method is

*The Educational Program for Piedmont Elementary School, Charleston, West Virginia: Kanawha County Schools, May 1970. pp. 80-81.

that of saving colleges and the young volunteers themselves from making unfortunate professional choices.

Another source of volunteers consists of young people who come from local junior and senior high schools. These volunteers are frequently members of the Future Teachers of America or other organizations within their schools. Some work on a one-to-one basis tutoring younger children in academic areas, while others perform clerical and noninstructional duties for the professional staff. Still others serve as Big Brothers or Big Sisters to the young boys or girls. In this relationship the Big Brother or Big Sister serves as a friend to the young child, but does not serve as a tutor in academic subjects. Many of the junior and senior high school volunteers provide their services during regular school hours, especially if the particular school has modular scheduling. However, others work with the young children after school hours. Occasionally the young child, especially an accelerated one, is taken to the junior or senior high school to work with a volunteer in some particular academic area. Thus volunteers gain practical experience that can be utilized in their future profession. For many, the experience of helping the young child is in itself a reward.

School-Based Teacher Educator

MITEC's primary responsibility is to provide meaningful clinical experiences for the student of teaching in order to bring about self-fulfillment of each individual. Therefore, the Center assumes an active role in identifying the teacher who demonstrates competence in teaching skills and interpersonal relationships to serve as a clinical supervising teacher. The teacher selected by MITEC is flexible, creative, and innovative. He is, himself, a student of teaching participating in the continuous education program provided by MITEC.

The role of the clinical supervising teacher is enhanced by the affiliation with MITEC. Because of this association, a wider range of experience modules are available for the student of teaching and clinical supervisor than could be provided by one institution alone. Specialized inservice programs and resource materials are provided for both clinical supervisors and students of teachers. Decisions concerning the individual programs of the students are made jointly by MITEC, the colleges, school-based teacher educators, and the student of teaching. This cooperative effort relieves the clinical supervisor of the sole responsibility for decision making he has traditionally assumed and now opens avenues for team planning and flexibility.

The MITEC concept emphasizes that the student of teaching and his clinical supervisor be members of an associate curricular team. Thus the student of teaching is exposed to a number of teaching styles and the full range of teaching activities taking place in the learning center.

The student of teaching has a home-base with a particular clinical supervising teacher with whom he can share his successes, his problems, and his apprehensions. However, by being a part of the associate team, he will, from observation of many models of teaching styles and

through encouragement and direction of the team, develop his own individual style of teaching.

Specifically, the clinical supervising teacher has three functions in working with students of teaching:

- He helps to diagnose the particular needs of the student of teaching as he progresses through the clinical experiences. As the needs of the individual are identified, the clinical supervising teacher and the student teacher jointly select experiences from the many options available through MITEC.
- Throughout the experiences the clinical supervising teacher assists the student in developing his teaching proficency.
- He helps the student of teaching evaluate his progress and determine how successful he has been.

MITEC may select outstanding master teachers who will teach cooperative methods classes, on site for students of teaching. These classes may also be team taught by college-based educators and clinical professors. Many flexible patterns are possible because of the multiple staff participants of MITEC. Through cooperation, the very best available personnel and resources can be pooled to offer quality instruction and experiences for inservice teachers as well as prospective teachers.

Teachers who are directly involved in supervising students of teaching in the Learning Center must attain certification through the West Virginia State Department of Education. Three levels of certification are Clinical Teacher, Class B; Clinical Teacher, Class A; and Teacher Education Associate.

The lowest level of certification, and the least demanding, is Clinical Teacher, Class B. This teacher educator holds a Professional Certificate endorsed for his area of specialization and the grade level where he supervises the student teacher. He must have completed two years of successful teaching with one year in his specialization before he is certified.

The second level of certification is Clinical Teacher, Class A. He, too, must hold the Professional Certificate and must have completed four years of successful teaching. In addition he has completed twelve hours of graduate credit, nine of which are from the Master's degree program in his area of specialization. He must be recommended by his principal, the county central office, MITEC, and his graduate college. Plans for competence ratings are being developed.

The Teacher Education Associate, the highest level of certification, is held by the Master Teacher. He has taught for five or more years and has successfully supervised two student teachers before he is certified. He has acquired a Master's degree, fifteen hours in graduate study in his area of specialization, and two graduate courses in supervision. Highly recommended by his principal and other teacher educators, he is creative and innovative. He is flexible, works well as a member of a team, and demonstrates empathetic relationships with his pupils and co-workers. He is, indeed, a master of teaching.

The professional organization, West Virginia Education Association, is collaborating with MITEC in efforts to have a differentiated honoraria for each level of certification. This is being proposed to the legislature and will be on a statewide basis.

Principal: Curriculum Leader of the School

The school system of today recognizes the principal as the person responsible for the supervision and improvement of the instructional program and the curriculum. The principal considers creating a climate which encourages experimentation and sharing as his most effective contribution to the improvement of instruction. However, unless the principal enthusiastically initiates and supports educational change in his school, it will not take place. Therefore, it is imperative that the principal initiate and support the teacher education program in his school, or it will not succeed.

As educational leader, the principal sets the overall tone of the school, and his conception of what constitutes a good school determines the quality of experiences possible for the student of teaching. He keeps informed of recent developments that affect the program in his building and provides appropriate leadership in injecting new knowledge and new experiences into the curriculum.

MITEC identifies principals who are instructional leaders, who express a desire and commitment to the cooperative center concept, who are open to experimentation and who have an enthusiastic staff. The school is then invited to become a Teacher Education Center and to be a member of the MITEC family. The principal and staff have orientation programs with the Advisory Committee. Together the school staff, with community representatives and MITEC Advisory Committee, plan inservice programs for clinical teachers. Materials are provided and instruction is given in improving teaching skills and developing competencies for working with students of teaching. The principal, by including community representatives in planning meetings for his school as a Teacher Education Center, is involving the community at the grass roots level.

The principal uses a series of inservice meetings to let the faculty and community identify their responsibilities for implementing the Center program. Committees are chosen to study MITEC objectives and philosophy and to report to the other members of the faculty their suggestions for organizing and using the program most effectively. The principal impresses upon the total faculty the significance of the involvement of the school in the important task of the professional preparation of teachers.

A continuous team atmosphere of planning, implementing, and evaluating takes place as inservice programs become an integral part of the total Center school program. Through the leadership of the principal, differentiated staffing patterns are designed which allow flexibility in released time for organizing team activities.

The principal points out to the school community the values of the teacher education program for strengthening the school's inservice education program. As a center it has the potential to provide opportunities for teachers to develop their teaching and interpersonal skills. It also provides frequent contacts with curriculum specialists from cooperating MITEC colleges, who bring to the program of instruction many new ideas for improving curricular practices. Parents are made aware that the teacher education program provides a valuable means of recruiting new teachers for the school system through a controlled screening process.

The principal participates in the selection of qualified clinical supervising teachers by identifying those teachers who have had successful teaching experience, who have desirable personal qualities and professional competence, and who have had preparatory study in the supervision of student teaching or are willing to enroll for such graduate study.

Classroom visits are made by the principal to prospective teachers to encourage an atmosphere of inquiry and experimentation in the classroom. The principal makes arrangements for clinical supervising teachers to observe other teachers in the school as well as visit centers. Teachers who have these opportunities will become more knowledgeable and will be able to demonstrate a variety of teaching/learning strategies.

An appointed time for meeting the students of teaching is designated by the principal during the semester. The first meeting comes before the novice teacher begins his induction into teaching. This meeting deals with general school policies that are presently followed. Students are made aware of their roles in carrying out these school policies. Among the several items discussed are such factors as arrival and dismissal time, school lunch procedures, pupil management, and central policies. This first meeting is a good time to share the school handbook, class schedules, and other information that may already be compiled into brochure form. The principal will discuss the school's philosophy toward education and its role in MITEC. At a later time, the principal will schedule a full day for each student of teaching to spend with him. This will give the prospective teacher a first hand experience with the administrative role of the instructional leader.

The need for high quality laboratory experiences in preparing teachers is not questioned. College students almost invariably name student teaching as the most valuable part of their preparation for teaching.

With the overwhelming acceptance of student teaching an important factor, it is only natural to assume that those who direct and supervise this aspect of the college student's work should be well prepared for their responsibilities. The building principal works closely with the clinical supervising teacher, the prospective teacher, the college-based teacher educator, and other MITEC resource personnel to insure a strong instructional program for boys and girls as well as for students of teaching.

County/School District Supervisor

The county supervisor is either an academic specialist or a generalist. He serves the elementary schools, the secondary schools, or both. A supervisor, be he specialist or generalist, supports those teachers and their programs for whom he is responsible. He is supportive, not critical.

The unique qualifications of the supervisor should provide him with the knowledge of teaching, methodology, theory, skills, practical application, and interpersonal relationships relevant to supporting all teaching personnel. Thus he is of immeasurable aid to the Center. He advises MITEC about particular instructional programs which demand specific skills, suggesting student teacher training in those programs. He recommends to MITEC specific clinical supervising teachers with whom student teachers might benefit the most.

The particular strength of a supervisor lies in his having been exposed to a variety of teaching situations. His experience and academic skill should hold him in good stead as a problem solver. The supervisor should be well-qualified to translate objectively administrative policies into practical working situations. He could well be the instigator of national programs of merit at the local level which could greatly enhance his own educational system.

The supervisor provides inservice for students of teaching and orients them to not only their local teaching situations but to national trends and research relative to their fields. He spends a day each semester with student teachers from MITEC colleges, taking them to see innovative programs in the school system, and acquainting them with county materials and services. The supervisor designs a supportive atmosphere for the student teacher during his internship, as well as during his crucial first year of teaching. In special cases where the student of teaching is to be certified for grades 1 through 12, the county supervisor works closely with MITEC's Center coordinator and clinical professor to arrange for classroom experiences at both the elementary and secondary levels. All of these supervisory acts benefit the school, the principal, the teacher, and the student of teaching.

Finally, the supervisor adds coherence to the student teaching experience. He contributes to the student of teaching a sense of direction, relevance, and cohesiveness beyond that provided by the administrator and his staff.

College Type Roles

The college supervisor of student teaching has become an enigma in higher education. Faced with significant increases in costs of operation, the colleges have seriously questioned the use of college faculty to visit student teachers during the time they are teaching. It is both an expensive program to maintain and difficult to defend in terms of effectiveness. Frequently, the college supervisor was able to make only a few cursory visits each semester and he stayed but a short time to observe. Conferences were brief and much of his time was spent on the road between schools. Colleges which assigned staff to this responsibility

often asked them to do it beyond the typical load of the colleague who taught on campus and thus the job was not viewed as an important responsbility.

As the importance of high quality laboratory experiences began to be recognized, however, the major concern of those who structure such experiences is "How can we be sure that student teaching and other laboratory experiences are first rate without spending the time of college supervisors to travel to the schools to visit and supervise?"

The colleges involved in the MITEC program have not developed a uniform answer to this question. Each is structuring policies and proced[illegible]es based upon its own philosophy of what it requires to assure quality in laboratory experiences. With the exchange of views made possible by the cooperative Teacher Education Center approach, a pattern has begun to emerge which is serving as a model for other colleges in the nation.

Basically the model calls for a re-definition of the term college supervisor. Typically, such a person is one who duplicates, to a considerable extent, the efforts of the school-based teacher educator. As schools assume greater responsibility for the laboratory experiences of students of teaching and new roles emerge within the staffs of the public schools, the college supervisor can become more than a visitor or inspector. His role becomes that of a college-based teacher educator.

The reason for developing this new role grew out of the assumption that there are two flaws in the old system. The first flaw is that frequent (or infrequent) visits to classrooms of student teachers for one-to-one supervision is inefficient and redundant if the clinical supervising teacher is well trained and competent in his job. The second assumption is that when the college supervisor and the clinical supervising teacher work together to achieve the same objective, there is a continual role identity crisis going on in the mind of each of the participants. Whose word takes precedence? Who is in charge? What happens when one uses one approach to achieve the objective and the othere uses another? What becomes of the student teacher in a conflict of approaches?

Thus the role "college-based teacher educator" begins to emerge. It begins with the acceptance of the notion that the clinical supervising teacher is a highly trained and competent classroom teacher. He possesses the skills of a master teacher. He has, by reason of thorough study and experience, gained a high level of proficiency at his chosen profession. If the clinical supervising teacher lacks anything in his preparation, it is the knowledge of how one works successfully with students of teaching. If he could receive this training, he would be qualified to perform the supervisory function alone.

Thus within the context of state law and through the encouragement and cooperation of the MITEC staff, the role of college-based teacher educator becomes more clearly defined.

Specifically, the college-based teacher educator possesses the qualifications of a college instructor with background in the development and application of instructional models and procedures and/or curricu-

lum development. He is concerned primarily with inservice education and he, therefore, must possess the skills necessary for the successful administration of a laboratory experience and continuing education program.

His duties lie almost totally in the realm of inservice education; he literally becomes a teacher of teachers. He might become involved in any or all of the following:

- Conduct orientation sessions early in each semester at a building center to acquaint new school-based teacher educators with policies and procedures for laboratory experiences, to review policy changes related to the laboratory experiences, and to plan jointly with public school-based teacher educators continuing education program
- Conduct inservice sessions in the schools designed to offer assistance in upgrading supervisory skills of public school-based teacher educators
- Cooperate with the fellow college faculty members and public school oficials in developing new approaches to graduate education that may occur in public school settings
- Identify new schools which may wish to participate in a center approach to laboratory experiences
- Assist the center director in identifying persons of potential who are interested in a career as a teacher educator in the schools
- Interpret and enforce existing policies as they relate to laboratory experiences and contribute to the revision and development of new or different policies for the various programs
- Be available, on a consulting basis, to deal with the particularly difficult problems of some student teachers. Such visiting as may take place will generally be on an invitation basis and done when mutual benefit can be obtained.

In addition, the college-based teacher educator may teach graduate and undergraduate courses in the field of professional education on campus. Moreover, he will perceive, as a significant part of his job, his work in the public schools in the capacity of teacher of teachers.

It is an exciting and challenging new role just now being developed. As the role continues to emerge, it promises to be one which will strengthen the program of teacher education at both the preservice and inservice levels.

Cooperative Type Roles

Students of Teaching

The MITEC approach may offer experience modules to the student of teaching over a six year period starting with his freshman year in college and running through a two year internship after graduation.

The linkage the public school or Learning Laboratory Center has to MITEC is one of offering learning experiences where a student of teaching may define and develop competencies that will aid his development as a teacher. This will make it necessary for the learning center to offer

a great variety of entry points for the student of teaching so that he might select those experiences he perceives as necessary to fulfilling his educational goals.

For example, he might gain initial entry into the Center as a college freshman by working as a college-based aide. In this capacity he might function as a tutor, or discussion leader. Depending on past experience, he might perform some specialized instructional task. In his sophomore year or even earlier, he may begin to perform some group instructional duties, aid in planning and preparation of instructional materials as a member of a teaching team, or any other task usually assigned to a teacher that he feels competent to perform.

Through MITEC, the student of teaching during this interim training period will have opportunities for multiple experiences in community activities, in different school settings ranging from the open-space learning laboratories, to rural, to special education, to urban. He will take some of his college classes on site at the Learning Laboratory Centers. These courses may be taught by a team of college academic professors, clinical professors, and master teachers. Thus, he will have met and worked with many of the community family of MITEC prior to his capstone experience of student teaching.

As stated earlier, these experiences would continue through his four years of undergraduate work and last until he had served a two-year internship after graduation. At present many states do not have an intern program for teachers. However, the experiences can still be carried on these last two years on an inservice basis. A suggestion has been made that the Kanawha County school system place intern teachers in a Learning Laboratory Center for a time before they are assigned a regular teaching position. This then casts the learning center in the role of a laboratory where students of teaching try to get at the skills, attitudes, and understandings requisite for the master teacher.

The fluid nature of MITEC permits an almost limitless number of experiences to be offered by the learning center and the student of teaching will be able to select from among them based on his perception of his own needs. It should also be remembered that no two people will approach an experience in exactly the same way. This is especially true if the learner is encouraged to use his own judgment and taste in his approach. This separation from the lockstep approach to teacher education requires that a new management tool be devised to replace "the every student doing the same thing in the same time" concept.

The present MITEC plan calls for a hand-generated, hand-recorded management instrument consisting of (1) a topical learning plan stating objectives, procedures, and evaluation of each topic or experience, (2) pre-and post testing or proof by performance, and (3) personal observation and written evaluation of each experience by the clinical supervising teacher. Each center will also have a resident clinical prefessor to serve a management function and provide liaison between the center, MITEC, and the participating colleges.

Future MITEC plans include a shift to an electronic management system, but until that time the management of experiences the student of teaching has in the Learning Laboratory Center must rest primarily with the resident staff of the Center.

Perhaps a note of caution should be sounded when one speaks of establishing any center for teacher education such as the laboratory concept. This voice of alarm comes from the experience of the laboratory schools founded by many colleges a number of years ago. Most of these centers of teacher education have lost their credibility as "the place" to train teachers.

Much has been said about why this has happened, but most people agree that their failure came about in large part because of their isolation from the reality of the average classroom. Everyone connected with ventures such as MITEC and the Learning Laboratory Center concept should remember that change heaped in one place tends to isolate, and dissemination of change is still the real battle.

Clinical Professor

As the wide range of educational experiences to be offered in the learning center came into focus, many questions arose concerning the supervision and evaluation of the program. Who would coordinate the many activities available to students of teaching? Could the MITEC coordinator be responsible for directing the inservice programs within the building? Can the college-based supervisor of student teachers, who is several hours away, adequately provide the supervision needed? Who will assure the college that the students are receiving adequate supervision from the clinical teachers?

Discussion of these questions and others led to general agreement that a school-based teacher educator was needed to coordinate the program. Through cooperative efforts of the college, the public schools, and MITEC, the position of clinical professor was defined and established.

This position is unique in that the clinical professor is appointed jointly by the public school and the college or university. He is a member of the college faculty, with all the privileges accorded a full time faculty member. He is, at the same time, a staff member of the Learning Laboratory Center to which he is assigned by the county. Approximately one half of his time is devoted to his duties as a public school teacher; the other half is designated to his duties as a school-based teacher educator.

The role of the clinical professor fills several needs. It provides a new career option for the professional classroom teacher who is not interested in moving into guidance or administration. The position provides, also, a liaison for MITEC, the college, and the public schools and strengthens the ties between them. The teacher education program in the school profits by the services of someone who is immediately available to assist the students of teaching and the clinical teachers.

As a public school teacher, the clinical professor participates on a teaching team in the learning center. He works with team members and

students to plan, present, and evaluate the student's learning experiences. He assists in curriculum development and other functions related to the school program.

As a school-based teacher educator, the clinical professor supervises the learning experiences of the students of teaching assigned to the center through MITEC and the college. In common with the clinical teachers, he is a counselor and guide for the student teachers, helping them gain skills necessary for good teaching. By presenting his teaching competencies for their observation and evaluation, he illustrates the methods and techniques they are to develop and establishes his credibility with them.

The clinical professor coordinates other phases of teacher education in the learning center. He helps each participating member of the teaching team define his responsibilities as they relate to the clinical experience. He is aware of the need for a program for the professionalization of the teacher's work as expressed by Lloyd S. Michael:

> Professional training is not likely to result in the development of professionally minded teachers unless the students have clinical experiences in schools where teachers function professionally.*

Thus, the clinical professor cooperates with MITEC and the college to establish continuous education programs to stimulate clinical teachers to improve their performance with students of teaching and with the school's pupils. He may help teachers design modules of experience to promote improved competencies and professional standards. Through all phases of the program he seeks to improve the environment for learning in the center.

Can the clinical professor reach fulfillment and self-actualization in his role? Can this be a life goal in itself, not just a step to something better? For the person who loves teaching and possesses the qualities of the master teacher, the clinical professorship can truly be a rewarding experience. He not only teaches children, but also teaches teachers of children. He has the opportunity to continue to learn and keep abreast of new developments in education. His vitality, enthusiasm, and scholarship can contribute greatly to the teaching and learning process. As Robert J. Schaefer has said of education, "Not only intriguing programs are required but also live models of the inquiring scholar with whom students can identify."**

Center Coordinator

The success of a cooperative Center is dependent on the ability of the coordinator to be a multi-faceted individual. This person is one who can encourage people from all areas of the community, the schools, and the colleges to pool their talents in creating teaching and learning

*"Responsibilities of School Systems for Clinical Experiences," *The Clinical Professorship in Teacher Education*, William R. Hazard (Editor). Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1967. p. 37.

**Schaefer, *op. cit.*, p. 52

situations which will challenge students and students of teaching to develop to their full potential.

The center coordinator, jointly hired by the colleges and public school system, is in a position to effect the administrative and operational changes in the public schools necessary to provide a framework in which improved teacher education experiences can take place. The coordinator must be dynamic, enthusiastic, skillful, creative, energetic, empathic, determined, altruistic, and above all, optimistic. He must be able to bring harmony where there may be discord, to pull people together, and to become a catalyst who inspires maximum performance with whatever resources are available. His primary responsibility is to administer the center program as directed by the governing body of the consortium, the Advisory Committee.

The welfare of the pupils in the classroom is of paramount importance. The school-based Teacher Education Center provides the orientation for this concern to be maintained in its proper perspective, and the center coordinator is the key person in seeing that this goal is implemented.

In considering applicants for the position of center coordinator, the candidate should have an advanced degree and teaching experience at all levels—elementary, secondary, and college. This enables him to relate to all facets of the continuous teacher education program. He should have a background in the development and application of instructional models, procedures, and curriculum development. He should also demonstrate an ability to teach the graduate course,"Supervision of Student Teaching," as well as conduct inservice programs for students of teaching, clinical supervising teachers, and building principals.

The specific duties of the center coordinator shall include:

1. Serve as liason between the institutions of higher learning and the public schools in all matters pertaining to teacher education
   a. Encourage universities to offer "on site" graduate courses specifically designed to improve competence and skill in teaching/learning ecology as well as self-actualization programs
   b. Encourage cooperative school-college inservice for students of teaching and clinical teachers to study and develop the process of learning how to learn, to conduct inquiry, to use technology effectively, and to become agents of change
      - Arrange these meetings on released time when possible
      - Utilize the team approach in conducting inservice
      - Utilize the human and physical resources of the teacher education institutions, the public schools, the state department of education, and the community
   c. Encourage all colleges to provide laboratory experiences for college sophomores and juniors in learning centers
2. Arrange linkages with community agencies: Appalachian Laboratory, youth centers, Job Corps, national programs, adult edu-

cation, and PACE Reading programs to provide the students of teaching many optional modules of experience according to individual interests and needs

   a. Stimulate experimental programs in teacher education, emphasizing novel arrangements for student teaching and encourage research by graduate institutions
   b. Encourage and schedule interschool observation by students of teaching of other students and other teachers at the beginning of the student teaching experience and at the completion; encourage interschool visitation and observation of different levels – elementary, junior, and senior highs; and arrange for observation and participation of school and community experiences with innovative projects
   c. Arrange for sharing of ideas and experiences of students of teaching by planning cooperative seminars with different colleges

3. Place students of teaching from all cooperating institutions of higher learning who are members of the Center
   a. Consult with principals, school administrators, clinical professors, and county supervisors in selection of quality schools as Teacher Education Centers
   b. Place students of teaching in the county in team situations where possible, identifying outstanding and innovative clinical teachers and team leaders
4. Provide clinical teachers and principals with a Center handbook containing policy, responsibilities, guidelines and suggestions for working with students of teaching; and revise handbook every two years to keep it current and relevant
5. Maintain a clearing house dissemination center for materials and information on teacher education
   a. Purchase the best materials on the market in teacher education within the budget allowance for Center materials
   b. Encourage the development of protocol and training materials by participating colleges as well as school Centers
   c. Catalogue and disseminate, upon request, commercially prepared materials as well as Center materials
6. Provide pre-student teaching seminars for prospective students of teaching to define their opportunities and responsibilities to the school, the community, the college, and the Center
7. Serve as a public relations agent whose purpose is to (1) create support within the community for the center concept of teacher education (2) encourage acceptance of professional responsibility for the preparation of teachers by all institutions connected with the Center
8. Prepare an annual report to be submitted to the Advisory Committee containing statistical data and progress on the teacher education program

Special Projects Coordinator

As MITEC has continued to expand its offerings of enrichment options to provide for the individual differences of students of teaching, the services of a special projects coordinator became increasingly necessary. The position was filled in June, 1971.

Students of teaching need to work with people who are versatile in dealing with human beings. Specifically, the special projects coordinator must display sensitivity and skill in responding to their personal and educational needs. This is especially important in the assistance received in selecting and completing experience modules which may begin as early as the freshman and sophomore years.

The coordinator of special enrichment projects must be able to promote a humanized atmosphere in which the student of teaching will be able to work face-to-face with real life situations. In this environment a future teacher can effectively develop his individualism as he strives to upgrade his affective as well as cognitive perceptions of the *What* and *Why* of teaching. Therefore, establishing mutually acceptable relationships between student and school and between student and community is a primary goal of MITEC.

The position of special projects coordinator is selected by and held accountable to the Advisory Committee of MITEC. Presently there is an option to select ten or twelve months employment. Legislative funds available through the State Department of Education helped make this position of special projects coordinator possible.

The coordinator of special projects must possess a masters degree and have a minimum of five years of successful classroom teaching in which superior teaching ability has been recognized. This classroom experience should encompass serving as a resource person or consultant in setting up experience modules for pre-service teachers. He must express interest in and demonstrate knowledge of teacher education preservice and continuing education.

The coordinator of special projects should have taken the following graduate courses: "Supervision of Student Teaching," "Instructional Models and Assessment Techniques," and "Advanced Instructional Strategies."

Effective communication with colleagues and children should be demonstrated by positive verbal and non-verbal behavior. Further, it is essential that he demonstrate a real interest in and understanding of people of all ethnic backgrounds by his associations and life style both in and out of the classroom.

It is additionally advantageous that the coordinator of special projects radiates a love of learning and life through his positive principles and practices. The specific duties of the coordinator of special projects shall include:

1. Assist the Center Coordinator in placement, inservice programs, arranging multiple modules of experience, and all facets of the MITEC operation

2. Work with Kanawha County supervisors, principals, and teachers in analysis and improvement of the Center program
3. Coordinate all activities involving the Job Corps with MITEC including observations, visits, and student teaching
4. Place, supervise, and conduct seminars for students of teaching who elect to do four weeks of their practicum at the Job Corps Center
5. Establish and maintain links with the Appalachian Lab, PACE Title III projects throughout the state, industry, the professions, and community to strengthen the teacher education program.
6. Work as a team with the Center coordinator and inservice coordinator to plan and conduct inservice programs for student teachers, clinical supervising teachers, and building principals
7. Correspond with colleges who have innovative programs and project directors in teacher education to arrange exchange programs and experience modules for MITEC students
8. Continue programs with McGill University, Montreal, Canada; Pittsburgh Inner-City, Pennsylvania; State University, Potsdam, New York; and the University of Alabama

Inservice Coordinator

Abilities, personalities, and teaching competencies vary greatly among teachers and students of teaching. Backgrounds and past experiences are vast. Entry into the teaching profession occurs at various levels. All these factors call for an individualized teacher education program for teaching candidates and also point to the need for individualized inservice programs for teachers and students of teaching on an open-ended continuum.

The inservice coordinator will be a liaison between the participating colleges and universities and the county inservice director. He will be the agent to identify outstanding resource persons from the academic and education disciplines of the various colleges who offer their services as consultants to the school system and to MITEC. Community and school resource persons, identified through the county inservice director, will work cooperatively with the college resource staff in individualizing inservice programs. The inservice coordinator will meet with the center coordinator and Advisory Committee to help plan MITEC inservice programs for students of teaching and for clinical supervising teachers. A description of some of these programs is offered in Chapter VI.

Research and Development Coordinator

The age of accountability is at hand for the nation's educational system. Parents are demanding that schools openly show them what their children are learning. Students are demanding that course work be more relevant, and that they have a part in planning their own cur-

riculum. Teachers are demanding that they have materials and media to help individualize learning experiences for children. They want teaching assistants, aides, and technicians as well as released school time for planning. Students of teaching demand they have more real experiences with children, community, and schools rather than all theory classes on how to teach. They are concerned with ways of measuring the learning of children.

Leon Lessinger, Professor of Education at Georgia State University, defines accountability as "a regular public report by independent reviewers of demonstrated student accomplishment promised for the expenditure of resources." He further identifies accountability in teacher training as "a program that will measure the effective teacher by his efforts upon students."*

As MITEC continues to grow, it sees accountability as the vehicle through which direction, expansion, and needs assessment will take place. MITEC plans to have an outside agent evaluate the program and objectives of the Center. It is anticipated that doctoral interns from two outside universities may be hired to study and set up evaluation instruments. They will (1) assess the effectiveness of the program as demonstrated by testing the learning competencies of students; (2) design instruments to measure the effectiveness of student teachers on cognitive and affective attitudes and growth of boys and girls; and (3) help design instruments which will be used in measuring process factors such as creativity, empathy, and warmth of students and teachers. Students of teaching who express special interest in research and development may have enrichment experience modules working with the doctoral team.

The doctoral interns will have the title of Research and Development (R&D) Coordinators. They will be paid by the Center, will receive credit on independent study from their respective universities, and will, with the approval of the Center Advisory Committee and their university committee, set up a research project for the year they are to be with MITEC. Each year there may be two new research and development coordinators, so a fresh viewpoint and original input of ideas will provide feedback to the Center's Advisory Committee. Research findings will be made available to each participating institution of MITEC. Results of the evaluation will be studied by the Advisory Committee and as a result of the study, recommendations will be prescribed for future direction of the Center.

---

*Dwight W. Allen and Eli Seifman, *The Teachers Handbook*. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1971, p. 73.

Chapter V

MITEC OPTIONAL ENRICHMENT MODULES

MITEC sees education of the future not confined within the walls of the schools or even in schools without walls, but as a life-long, world-minded process with many roads and many choices available to each individual traveler. MITEC is attempting to open new and exciting enrichment avenues for learning for boys and girls, teachers, and students of teaching through community, school, and self-fulfilling life experiences. The multiagencies of MITEC are listening to the pulse of student teacher's excitement hammering to us in loud, clear reverberations, calling for a voice in sharing the future and sharing the destiny of mankind and of self.

Three cycles of capstone experiences are possible for the student of teaching. However, prior to his capstone experiences, the student teacher will have had many previous laboratory and community experiences in early college years as was referred to in the model, Chapter I, and in the role of the colleges, Chapter III. The capstone experience modules will come during the student teacher's senior year and are projected for the intern years as well.

Cycle I would occur in one of the six Learning Laboratory Centers. As MITEC continues to grow, several more laboratory centers will be identified. Cycle I will be eight weeks duration or longer, depending on the individual needs of each teacher candidate. The student teacher, as a member of a teaching team in the Laboratory Center, will plan, teach, and evaluate an individual unit in his academic area as well as team teach a unit.

In addition, he may complete a self-instructional community module during Cycle I which will familiarize him with all social, cultural, and economic factors of the community in which he is teaching. This community module is described in Chapter III. He may then engage in a community activity of his choice, such as a health agency project, an ecology project, a welfare agency, or recreational project. Length and depth of the projects are determined by individual or group de-

signed contracts approved by the associate team. These community projects are an integral part of the process of "becoming." They take place simultaneously with school-based experiences.

When he has his first encounter with a Learning Laboratory Center, the student of teaching becomes a member of an associate team. The team is composed of approximately ten members including teachers, clincal supervising teachers, students of teaching at various levels, clinical professors, and community volunteers. Each student of teaching will be given the opportunity to progress through various learning experience modules at his own rate and to design modules unique to his interests and potential. He will have many opportunities to develop an awareness of self through exploring his values, feelings, and perceptions, as well as to develop an awareness of his influence upon others.

The associate team will provide continuous feedback to the student of teaching and will serve as a sounding board in an advisory capacity. This group structure will give students of teaching opportunities to relate to and interact with prospective teachers from other colleges, to work with various levels of student learning, and to work with the community. This wide range of learning should enable each member of the team to grow in self-actualization and to grow in the process of group dynamics.

The process of self-actualization, therefore, is not confined to Cycle I alone, but is the basis upon which MITEC is founded and operates. It is the continuous process which allows each student of teaching to develop his own personal, unique style of teaching at his own rate. MITEC encourages a humanistic program which concentrates on developing prospective teachers who will be more sensitive to the needs of children.

Cycle II provides opportunities for enrichment experience modules of two to four weeks duration, depending on the interest of the student of teaching and the amount of involvement he prescribes for himself. It is proposed that student teachers who have had multiple laboratory experiences in early college years and who have completed Cycle I, will be ready to assume responsibility for designing, implementing, and evaluating enrichment modules in Cycle II. These modules may include (1) community school live-in experiences, (2) summer creativity programs, (3) summer camps for disadvantaged and handicapped, (4) remedial reading and math centers, (5) Appalachian Education Mobile Labs, (6) career and technical centers, (7) Job Corps Centers, and (8) Opportunities for Industrialization Centers (OIC). Some of the modules may be on a paid basis occurring in the summer as well as during the academic year.

As the program and variety of experiences grow, one way to meet individual needs of students of teaching may be through computer assistance. The computer will print out numerous enrichment experiences and resource contacts. The student of teaching, consulting with the associate team, will opt experiences of his choice and the computer will provide the management system. MITEC envisions computer as-

sistance management for MITEC pre-student teaching laboratory experiences, simulation experiences, self-instructional modules, and evaluation feedback.

MITEC realizes the teacher of tomorrow must be a versatile person and that teaching experience in one setting will not adequately prepare him for the challenges of the future. Therefore, Cycle III gives the student teacher (1) options for experience in other centers throughout the state, (2) options for experience in other states, particularly with inner-city schools and with other cultural areas, and (3) options for an international experience. Samples of three enrichment modules have been selected, from the many available through MITEC, to give the reader a perspective of the value of enrichment experiences for students of teaching.

Cycle III illustrates how MITEC is responding to the challenge of preparing teachers for the real world of today as well as for the unpredictable world of tomorrow. The prospective teacher of tomorrow must be humane, flexible, world-minded, and knowledgeable. In addition, he must be able to understand himself, those he teaches, and those with whom he communicates from all walks of life.

Job Corps Center Module

MITEC colleges have had a cooperative program with the Charleston Job Corps Center for Women since 1968. MITEC welcomes the opportunity of providing the student of teaching with opportunities for working and studying with students who have been labeled by society as "unsuccessful school dropouts."

Job Corps Centers are deeply concerned with providing a second chance for these students. The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education* and Job Corps designed a cooperative program to give students of teaching an opportunity to participate in centers throughout the United States.

Job Corps Centers throughout the country offer teacher education experiences where minority groups are the majority, where conditioned losers become winners, and where students of teaching can have the opportunity to discover how this happens.

The Job Corps curriculum is unique in many ways. It seeks to equip a student for a specific job in a fairly short period of time. It carefully screens materials for the purpose of eliminating anything which offers no "payoff" in terms of acquiring job skills. In all cases, the Corpsmen are in their late teens or early twenties, and most have experienced school failure of some type. To delay job entry by giving attention to nonvocational topics may be to lose the student who now seeks to become a productive citizen and hopes to achieve this status quickly.

Two significant instructional innovations of value to teachers and to students of teaching are in operation at the Charleston Job Corps Center. The first is the Dial Access Retrieval System, which accommo-

*American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, *Job Corps: A Resource for Teacher Education*. Washington, D. C. The Association, 1969.

dates 240 taped lessons at a given time. Forty carrels are placed throughout the Center and may be used by students at any time, night or day. Student teachers have opportunities to design unique, creative taped lessons to meet the individual needs of Corpsmen. Through the use of easily accessible tapes, the teacher is able to extend his efforts to many individuals while maintaining a personalized program for each student. The tapes may be changed when desired, and like other facets of the program, are not meant to become static.

The second significant innovation, unique to any Job Corps Center, is the Evaluation and Reporting System, which is designed to make every staff member in the Job Corps Center aware of the progress of every enrollee at all times. The individual progress reports, which are the heart of the Evaluation and Reporting System, are recorded daily on a master card, and are signed by the enrollee as well as the instructor. By signing each of these reports, the student always knows his accomplishments and where he is in relation to the completion of his total instructional program. Using the Job Corps Evaluation and Reporting System as a model, some of the participating colleges in MITEC are designing similar systems for progress reports of student teachers. This is one example of the many ways Job Corps ideas may be communicated and may be applied in the school system and the colleges.

Three additional linkages of schools, colleges, and community cooperation have emerged as a result of this pilot student teaching experience module at the Charleston Job Corps Center: (1) A training program in group counseling has been established by Marshall University at the Job Corps. Public school counselors and Job Corps counselors are enrolled in a graduate course on site at the Charleston Job Corps Center for Women. The counselors are given an opportunity to apply classroom theory immediately with Corpsmen in group counseling sessions. Their accompanying practicum takes place at the Job Corps. (2) Teachers and principals, through MITEC arrangements, visit the Job Corps for observation and discussion sessions with key instructional personnel as well as Corpsmen. (3) Through arrangements of the Center Coordinator, out-of-state visitors as well as student teachers from seven colleges and universities of MITEC have the opportunity to tour the Job Corps Center for an orientation to the program, to visit classes, to talk with students, and to meet the staff.

The student of teaching, during his Job Corps module, can "test himself" by examining his attitude and perhaps change his personal concept about the world in which he lives. He has numerous experiences in interpersonal relationships with the Corpsmen, one-to-one teaching-learning situations, and small group interaction. He must be able to analyze learning problems, prescribe programs, develop materials, and evaluate learning in an educational agency committed to giving young people a second chance. He can test himself in his ability by systematically assessing the learning achievement, attitude, and progress of Corpsmen.

Close pupil-teacher relationships during the Job Corps experience module provide an opportunity for the mutual development of personal

awareness and empathy. Corpsmen are motivated through self-direction to achieve a goal that has real meaning and application to their lives. This realization as applied through self-analysis is a most valuable learning experience for student teachers.

Remedial Reading Center Module

Reading is one of the most crucial areas of concern in education today. Although most students of teaching have had theoretical courses in "Teaching of Reading," they lack the practical know-how and lack skill and knowledge of varieties of ways to analyze and prescribe programs for individual children. Secondary student teachers are amazed to find children in junior and senior high with third and fourth grade reading proficiencies. Many express utter confusion and loss as to how to cope with these unforseen problems in all areas of the curriculum. Students of teaching say, "College didn't prepare us for this."

MITEC attempts to help these concerned students of teaching acquire expertise in working with children of all levels who have learning and reading deficiencies. The student of teaching may opt to spend four weeks in the PACE Reading Center with nine reading specialists. Student teachers combine theory and practice in a laboratory setting as they work with children under the direction and guidance of reading clinician specialists. They learn to diagnose, prescribe, and evaluate reading programs for children on an individual basis. They also learn to use reading techniques in all areas of curriculum planning and instruction.

After intensive training in the reading clinic, the student teacher may want to pursue additional experience in reading. He may opt to spend a module of time working with a "staff teacher" in a Learning Laboratory Center. A staff teacher, with specialized training in reading, is assigned to each school center. He serves as a "floating" resource team member and helps teachers plan programs and develop materials on various reading levels within their academic disciplines. He also teaches demonstration lessons utilizing his skills in adapting materials to various children's learning levels. Student teachers who elect to spend a module of experience with the staff reading teacher have teaching opportunities in many academic disciplines and at many grade levels.

Another strategy aimed at preventing rather than remediating failure led to the development of the Kanawha County PACE project *School for Thinking*, in 1970. Dr. Hans G. Furth* helped develop this pilot program in Kanawha County and serves as a consultant in its expansion and implementation in other schools. He combines Piaget's theory of intellectual development and the perceptual therapy techniques of modern optometry. Dr. Furth, working together with PACE of Kanawha County, has developed diagnostic and prescriptive techniques and materials to be used in this unique thinking concept school.

*Hans G. Furth, *Piaget for Teachers*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1970, p. 49.

Why such a school? Research tells us that (1) the lack of basic perceptual skills affects participation in formal educational activities; and (2) if a child has faulty thinking skills, his ability to adjust to his environment will be hindered. We also know that the extent and richness of the vocabulary controls accuracy and depth in thinking.

The School for Thinking serves as a valuable link to the community, as a training center for students of teaching as well as teachers, and serves as a demonstration and research center for experimentation in creativity for the Kanawha County School System. Students of teaching, working in the *School for Thinking*, have unique experiences in teaching young children to think—not to be passive absorbers, but active inquirers and explorers.

Inner-City, Interstate, Intrastate, International Modules

Today's mobile society calls for teachers who are flexible, who can adapt to varied geographic areas, and who continue to learn along with children who may be of different cultures and have different life styles from theirs. In Cycle III, MITEC provides students of teaching several options of experiences in environments other than their school and college background. Chapter III describes how plans are being implemented for creating statewide Teacher Education Centers based on the Kanawha County MITEC model.

Students throughout the state are able to opt experiences on a statewide basis. They may choose a city school or an Appalachian poverty level school or they may choose a surburban setting. They may choose a penal institution, a social service institution, or a mobile school. Undergraduates are able to make career choices long before they graduate from college and become professional educators.

Teacher education throughout the country is addressing itself to the need of preparing more teachers for inner-city settings. Storefront schools, open schools, and modular schools are developing in urban areas. They are attempting to reach out to boys and girls who want more than traditional schools have been able to offer in relevant education. Concern for these students and their goals led MITEC to explore ways of preparing teachers who could be effective in inner-city settings and could relate education to the real world. For this reason, MITEC allied with AACTE/University of Pittsburgh: Urban Education Leadership Development Project (UELDP), which grew out of the AACTE Commission on Education of the Disadvantaged.

One of the MITEC member institutions belongs to UELDP. As this project developed, much information on inner-city teaching was collected, and West Virginia State College made contacts which resulted in the development of an inner-city teacher education center in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Specifically, the inner-city experience has a three-fold purpose:

- To provide laboratory experience in inner-city schools
- To provide a means for preparing and testing protocol materials for teacher education, relevant to inner-city schools

- To utilize the rich and diverse ethnic and cultural experiences student teachers bring with them as a positive starting point to continue their growth. They will utilize the richness of the experience of the inner-city children as a positive starting point.

Teachers graduating from this curriculum will have gained confidence in themselves by using their own materials and experiences to conduct workshops for public school teachers and other teacher education students back at their home base, MITEC. Ultimately, of course, children in the public schools will be the benefactors of this program.

The inner-city curriculum includes community involvement, independent study, and seminars. Each student teacher is required to develop a mini-course to be used back on the campus as part of the teacher preparation curriculum. In reality, students on the job will be developing teacher training materials for on-campus use with freshmen and sophomores. Part of the student's curriculum will be visiting magistrates' courts, welfare offices, community centers, and innovative programs in nearby schools. Thus the classroom of the MITEC student of teaching extends beyond the walls of the seminar room or the public school.

A cultural experience provides MITEC students of teaching the opportunity to work with Indian children in their native environment. MITEC and State University, located at Potsdam, New York, have an exchange program. State University students have the opportunity to come to West Virginia for a teaching experience with Appalachian children. MITEC students may opt to teach and work on an Indian reservation. Through studying the anthropological foundations and mores of the Indian culture, the student of teaching is addressing himself to the problem of learning how to relate to another segment of a multicultural society.

In each of the inter-state modules, the student of teaching will learn much more about himself and how he adapts to new experiences. He also will analyze and adjust his behavior to his life style as it relates to other human beings.

As the classroom of MITEC expands beyond the walls of the school, to the community, to the entire state, to other states, it next focuses on the international scene. How well are we preparing our future teachers in international and intercultural education? MITEC envisions this as a crucial focus of concern in teacher education preparation for tomorrow's children and tomorrow's world.

The Center believes in preparing world-minded teachers. It is exploring the possibility of Latin American and European teaching experience modules. MITEC now has an exchange program with McGill University, Montreal, Canada. In the spring of 1971, four student teachers, one from each of four MITEC colleges, participated in a teaching/learning enrichment experience in Canada.

Chapter VI

EMERGING DIMENSIONS IN CONTINUOUS EDUCATION

The Multi-Institutional Teacher Education Center is dedicated to the concept of a partnership commitment in teacher education and to professional development as a continuous process. The responsibility rests equally with the public schools and colleges to upgrade all components of teacher education; pre-service, internship, and inservice. MITEC is committed to preparing prospective teachers and inservice teachers to become diagnosticians of students' needs and learning problems, innovators, planners, and implementors of ideas.

The Center's involvement in inservice has a two-fold purpose. First of all, through the use of numbers of individuals from various institutions and an increase in time spent by those individuals, the process of continuous teacher education is strengthened and made more meaningful.

Secondly, through increased expertise that is made available to the public schools through the Center, greater amounts and more concentrated inservice can be directed to the teachers themselves. Thus the two-fold purpose would result in more meaningful student teaching experiences and, at the same time, allow the influence of ideas to develop in the public schools through the use of college personnel. It is anticipated that highly competent elementary and secondary teachers will evolve as a result of continuous education programs. A corollary process to continuous education is not only the exchange of ideas between college and public school personnel but a greater exposure of college-based teacher educators will be provided in the public schools.

Most research studies on inservice teacher education conclude that when changes occur they are the result of a continous program of training. Rubin's study of inservice attempted to find relationships among some of the more important variables which might affect teacher growth. Rubin's findings state that "teachers are more effective when

they have alternative strategies with which to teach a given lesson, each of these strategies must be acquired systematically and each must be perfected through cumulative practice."* One day shot-in-the-arm approaches to inservice have relatively no lasting effect and tend to cause little, if any, behavior change in teaching/learning.

An inspiring message may revitalize one for the moment, but how long does this vitality last? How, then, can continuous inservice be implemented and how can teachers themselves assume responsibility for assessing their needs and help in planning their inservice programs? How can assessment and evaluation be accomplished and new or alternative variables be identified in a continuous education process?

Inservice for Clinical Supervising Teachers

MITEC has attempted to meet these challenging questions through a variety of inservice approaches. Learning Laboratory Centers which have a resident clinical professor are in ideal positions to offer continuous inservice programs for the entire school staff uniting pre- and inservice teacher education. The clinical professor coordinates the continuous inservice programs by calling upon the resource staff and materials of colleges, county, and state departments. MITEC has a collection of teacher education materials including many self-instructional kits. Schools as centers may select specific inservice areas to meet their particular needs. Through team structure and differentiated staffing patterns in the Learning Laboratory Centers, much of the inservice can be offered on released teaching time.

Area meetings for clinical supervising teachers and principals are sponsored by MITEC in several geographic locations. To illustrate, the theme for one of the area meetings was "Conferences Which Stimulate Self-Evaluation." Each area group developed criteria for student teacher-supervising teacher conferences and identified specific observable teaching behaviors. Groups used videotaped micro-teaching lessons or five-minute live teaching sessions. Role-playing conferences involved all participants in a "trioing" process. One member acted as the student teacher, one the clinical supervising teacher and the third, the monitor. This sequence allowed all members to be active participants in improving conferencing skills.

Various approaches to area meetings have been tried by MITEC. At one area meeting, clinical supervising teachers attended an afternoon session while students of teaching were responsible for classroom activities. Following school dismissal, students of teaching then joined the inservice session. This provided a new stimulus for interaction.

Luncheon workshops sponsored each semester by MITEC pay special tribute to the clinical supervising teachers. Other special guests invited are legislators, community representatives, state department and county administrative staff, principals, and college representatives. National consultants, prominent in teacher education, are invited to

*Louis J. Rubin, *A Study on the Continuing Education of Teachers*. New York: Ford Foundation, 1969. (ED036487) p. 13.

interact with participants and to evaluate objectively the Center program. Following the luncheon, small interaction groups are formed which include a cross-section of participants. Each group explores current issues of teacher education as they relate to MITEC and to West Virginia's plans for regionalization of centers.

Usually the state directors of laboratory experiences from West Virginia's teacher education colleges hold their two-day state meeting in conjunction with MITEC's luncheon workshop. This plan offers the opportunity for a state-wide focus on teacher education, allows the participants to interact and share ideas from the six Teacher Education Centers throughout West Virginia, and offers the opportunity for sharing expenses in these joint meetings, as well as sharing consultants.

Just as Kanawha County's theme is based upon the philosophy of continuous progress for each individual child, so is the philosophy of MITEC for each student of teaching, teacher of students, and teacher of teachers.

One approach MITEC is using at the elementary level to attain the goal of continuous progress through inservice is a series of area meetings offered to clinical supervising teachers and principals on released time. In each of the sequential meetings spanning a five-week time period, the focus centers on teacher competence and accountability. A team teaching approach is used and each of the five sessions is action oriented. Teachers and principals are involved in micro-teaching, facilitating inquiry methods of teaching, and simulation experiences. As a follow-up, the group will be invited to work with college staff in developing a competence-based evaluation system for analyzing teaching behaviors.

The next step envisioned by MITEC is to offer continuous progress inservice for secondary clinical supervising teachers and principals on released time. This will take a great many more instructional staff members, but can be accomplished in the following manner: A series of meetings could be scheduled on a rotation basis according to academic disciplines. Each of the participating institutions of higher learning could be invited to select two professors for each academic discipline, one from the education department and one from each discipline area. The state department of education specialist, and the county specialist could join each discipline group in planning sessions for the series of inservice meetings.

A cross-fertilization of educational experiences is predicted to cause a revolution in this meeting of the minds. The door could be opened to new realms of cooperation as professors from academic disciplines meet with education professors and teachers in Learning Laboratory Centers to explore the analytical study of teaching.

Several new graduate courses have been developed as a result of teachers' requests for classes which will help them improve teaching skills and which will assist them in organizing learning activities for boys and girls in the classroom. Graduate courses are offered on site, at centrally located school centers, and are sometimes taught by a team of professors representing several of the institutions of MITEC.

In the four years of the Center's existence, over 350 teachers have taken the course "Supervision of Student Teaching." Other courses especially designed at the request of teachers are: "Instructional Models and Assessment Techniques," "Advanced Strategies in the Analytical Study of Teaching," "Team Teaching," "Facilitating Inquiry in the Classroom," and "Curriculum Planning for Individualizing Instruction."

The Advisory Committee of MITEC proposed to the county school system that an "on site" continuous program be offered at a school center to be designed by the faculty of that building. The request was made to offer both inservice and graduate credit to the faculty members.

State department, college, and county personnel of MITEC all agreed to cooperatively teach the course with no remuneration. They further agreed that each seminar or work session be designed to model an "ideal" lesson, giving attention to early inductive or perceptual activities and culminating in a capstone or "doing" phase. Each session also had an evaluation measure built into the overall plan. The assumption was (1) that as teachers, each should demonstrate the qualities of "master teacher" and (2) inservice education should be functional and should include a trial phase to insure that the behaviors considered actually became a part of the repertory of the behaviors of the participants.

The project was piloted at a new suburban school center. The faculty participated in three exploratory organizational meetings to plan the kinds of activities they felt would meet the needs of their school program. The course developed under a broad umbrella designed around the theme of "Teacher Behavior." Each of the several components pertained to one skill area, but each was interlocking. The skill areas defined were: nonverbal behavior, verbal behavior, reaching the child (ability levels), student inquiry, teacher flexibility, human resource development, and teacher appraisal behavior. These skills were considered with an eye to cognitive, affective, and psycho-motor components. The objective was to sensitize teachers to be aware and concerned about each student.

When synthesized in the final sessions, the teacher taking the inservice course was able to define his own teaching style and have an expanded range of behaviors available to him in his classroom.

Inservice for Students of Teaching

"Where can I find the materials I need to supplement and enrich my teaching? Could anyone else possibly be having as much trouble with defining and accomplishing objectives? What teaching strategies could I use to help solve discipline problems? Can't anyone help me with grouping and individualizing instruction?" On and on one could identify problems of student teachers and beginning teachers. How is help achieved?

MITEC pools resources of the county school system, the state department of education, and participating colleges and universities to

offer quality inservice programs. Projected for West Virginia's Teacher Education Centers is a central resource center where individually packaged learning kits would be developed and disseminated on problems most common to beginning teachers. Students of teaching, school-based teacher educators, and colleges would set up ad-hoc committees to develop these kits. They would be evaluated and revised continually. Objectives, training materials, practice instructions, and evaluation would be basic to each kit. In addition to the training kits, a storage bank of video tapes, protocol materials, and supply of commerical teacher education materials would be available to all centers within the state.

MITEC cooperatively sponsors many inservice opportunities for students of teaching. Several of these are briefly described in the following section.

Student teachers from all participating colleges of MITEC are invited to take part in Kanawha County's pre-school orientation week in the fall. All colleges agree to this orientation, regardless of their individual college calendars. This week-long orientation provides opportunity for the student of teaching to get acquainted with faculty, policy, and philosophy of his school center and to have the same orientation as a regular faculty member. He and his clinical supervising teacher can get to know one another at this time, can plan and organize together, and can examine teaching materials and media.

During the orientation week, all student teachers meet together with the MITEC staff to get acquainted and to learn about the teacher education consortium and the inservice opportunities offered during the semester. The last day of orientation week, students of teaching meet boys and girls as they arrive for the opening day of the school year.

Joint seminars are arranged by clinical professors in schools or clusters of schools designated as Learning Laboratory Centers. Students of teaching from several different colleges meet to explore mutual concerns and problems as they develop in the art of becoming and in the analytical study of teaching as a process. The students of teaching identify areas of concern, and through group process reinforce and objectively evaluate one another. The clinical professor arranges for resource personnel from the participating agencies of MITEC to act as consultants.

Kanawha County's supervising specialists meet with students of teaching each semester to acquaint them with materials and services the county provides for teachers. These meetings are in the form of workshop sessions and give county staff an opportunity to get to know potential teachers. Students of teaching are also invited to attend, with their clinical supervising teachers, special inservice programs sponsored by the county. Over 100 choices of inservice opportunities are offered to Kanawha County teachers. They select twelve hours during the year and are paid for this inservice training.

Counseling, guidance, and psychological services are available to all students in the Kanawha County system. Students of teaching meet

with the guidance counselors in group sessions to gain knowledge and experience in referral procedures and counseling skills.

The Center arranges visits to special schools and community agencies for groups of student teachers. A few of these include special education schools, community schools, career and technical schools, open-space innovative schools, reading centers, youth centers, the planetarium, and the Job Corps Center. In addition to tours, special arrangements are made for students of teaching to observe master teachers at other school centers. They may also observe other students of teaching working at different levels of teaching. These observations are planned with specific purposes so that values, teaching skills, and teaching methods can be discussed in seminars following visits.

Each term MITEC students of teaching plan an overnight retreat in a secluded, wooded campsite setting. This is a time of great fellowship, and a time to reminisce about the total picture of educational preparation and experiences for becoming teachers. Student representatives from each participating college meet together for several joint planning sessions in preparation for the retreat. Rap sessions, group singing, fishbowling, and panel discussions are among the action oriented happenings at the retreat. College-based teacher educators are invited guests and are included in the many entertaining and educational activities. Following the retreat, students of teaching publish a newsletter so they may capture their ideas and remember experiences of this momentous occasion.

Evaluation of the total inservice program is done each semester by MITEC. Questionnaires are distributed to the student of teaching so he may rate the effectiveness of each inservice as it relates to personal benefits he receives in preparing him for teaching. The student of teaching also rates his placement, his clinical supervising teachers, principal, and school center. He may also give recommendations for improving the program. The Advisory Committee studies the evaluation results for future placement and for Center program modification and expansion.

SUMMING IT UP

In summary, probably no aspect of contemporary practice is less satisfactory than the continued education of teachers after they have joined the full-time staff of a school system. Much of the training is fragmented and unrelated to the nature of the tasks that teachers are asked to perform daily. It is usually provided by a college consultant and is given in the traditional classroom manner. This is true in spite of the fact that the content lends itself to a clinical approach that reflects the refinement of definition of performance tasks that now seems possible.

Teacher education on the college campus has traditionally been of two types: general introductory courses offered to undergraduate students of teaching and advanced specialized programs in such fields as school administration or guidance. The former has typically lacked the definition that is essential in any self-assessment program and the latter assumes that teachers should seek to advance outside the classroom. The beginning teacher is often forced to specialize prematurely away from teaching because these are the only courses available. Continuing education experiences seldom meet the needs of the novice teacher. Needless to say, the same principles that apply to learning for the public school child apply to planning continuing education experiences for teachers.

McGeoch and Olsen refer to the spirit of cooperation that must begin to characterize the education of teachers:

> . . . it is now patently clear that the title 'teacher educator' no longer belongs to college faculty exclusively. It is the rightful possession of *all* who participate in the professional preparation of teachers: classroom teachers, school supervisors, department chairmen, building principals, superintendents, college supervisors, college professors, and college administrators. It also belongs to professional personnel employed by state departments of education, professional organizations, the federal government, and local community agencies. Think of the potential for action when all of these professional persons come together in one organization. . . .*

*D. McGeoch and H. Olsen, "The Charge to Action," in Lindsey, Margaret (ed.), *Teacher Education: Future Directions*. A report of the Fiftieth Anniversary Conference of the Association for Student Teaching, 1970, p. 143.

This spirit of cooperation to bridge the gap between the college and the public school is now occuring in West Virginia. The model presented in this publication is a flexible one, involving all teacher educators in localized and statewide programs. The college, by virtue of its concentration of specialized personnel, handles those functions which have a substantial theoretical, and not exclusively practical, application. The public school contributes in those areas where specific practical applications are required, thus viewing its curriculum and personnel resources as available for teacher education purposes as well as for the education of children. Other agencies contribute as the need arises.

But still another step is needed, one which now seems to be underway in West Virginia: sequencing the preservice and inservice education of teachers so that teacher education is truly continuous. As one observes the content, such a step is possible with the recent refinement of the definition now given to the performance tasks of teachers and the development of behaviorized certification standards. But it means greater demands being placed on the linkage components presently existing and the development of others. It means greater concessions for the common good in determining responsibility for functions once thought to be totally the responsibility of the college or the public school. *It is working in West Virginia.*